

BRILL'S STUDIES IN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

General Editor

A.J. VANDERJAGT, University of Groningen

Editorial Board

M. COLISH, Oberlin College

J.I. ISRAEL, University College, London

J.D. NORTH, University of Groningen

H.A. OBERMAN, University of Arizona, Tucson

R.H. POPKIN, Washington University, St. Louis-UCLA

VOLUME 68



THE PSALMS COMMENTARY OF GILBERT OF POITIERS

From Lectio Divina to the Lecture Room

BY

THERESA GROSS-DIAZ



E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1996

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gross-Diaz, Theresa.

The Psalms commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers : from lectio divina to the lecture room / by Theresa Gross-Diaz.

p. cm. — (Brill's studies in intellectual history, ISSN 0920-8607 ; v. 68)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 9004102116 (cloth : alk. paper)

1. Gilbert, de La Porrée, Bishop, ca. 1075-1154. Commentarius in Psalmos. 2. Bible, O.T. Psalms—Commentary—Early works to 1800. 3. Bible, O.T. Psalms—Commentaries—History and criticism. 4. Bible, O.T. Psalms—Criticism, interpretation, etc.—History—Middle Ages, 600-1500. 5. Gilbert, de La Porrée, Bishop, ca. 1075-1154. I. Title. II. Series.

BS1429.G553G76 1995

223'.207—dc20

95-41176

CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Gross-Diaz, Theresa:

The psalms commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers : from lectio divina to the lecture room / by Theresa Gross-Diaz. – Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill, 1995

(Brill's studies in intellectual history ; Vol. 68)

ISBN 90-04-10211-6

NE: GT

ISSN 0920-8607

ISBN 90 04 10211 6

© Copyright 1996 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

*This work is dedicated to
my parents
Raymond A. ("Big Ray") Gross
and
June R. Gross
and to my whole family*

*with special thanks to
my husband
William Diaz*

In memory of Margaret T. Gibson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ix
Abbreviations	xi
Foreword	xiii
 Chapter One Gilbert's academic career	 1
Chapter Two Manuscripts and <i>mise en page</i>	25
The date of the commentary	27
The <i>mise en page</i>	35
The cross-index	51
Chapter Three The academic <i>accessus</i> and the Psalms as literature	 66
Chapter Four The sources for Gilbert's Psalms Commentary	 97
The named sources	97
Other contemporary commentaries	112
Chapter Five Gilbert and the <i>Glossa ordinaria</i>	122
The <i>parva</i> and <i>ordinaria</i> glosses	125
The textual parallels	131
Conclusion: Gilbert as exegete	149
Appendix One: Cross-index	157
Appendix Two: Manuscripts	160
Bibliography	181
General Index	189
Index of manuscripts cited	193

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I cannot begin to thank all the individuals and institutions without whom this work would never have seen the light of day. However, I would like particularly to express my gratitude to the staffs at the *Salle des Manuscrits* of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; the Bibliothèque Saulchoir, Paris; the Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris; the Bibliothèque Municipale, Laon; the Bibliothèque Municipale, Valenciennes; the United Libraries of Seabury Western and Garrett Evangelical Seminaries, Evanston; the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich; and the Bibliothèques Municipales of Tours and Troyes, which welcomed me when I first began this study many years ago.

Among mentors and muses in the realm of Clio, I have foremost to thank Marcia Colish, who has been “gooder’n ary angel”; Robert E. Lerner; Lesley Smith; Richard Kiekhefer; E. Ann Matter; Charles Radding; Karlfried Froehlich; Barbara Rosenwein; John van Engen; John Contreni; and last only in calendar terms, Patricia Stirnemann.

For most welcome support of a primarily (but not exclusively) non-academic nature, I am grateful to the Metry family of Soissons, France; Maureen Flanagan; Mary Greuel; Isabelle Sèruzier; Claire Bouquet des Chaux; Louise Berge-Robertson; Fabienne Queyroux. Of all my wonderfully supportive (if bemused) family, too numerous to mention, I wish to single out my sister Mary Kay for her constant encouragement; my dad, for his constant challenge; and my husband William, for everything.

Even with all that assistance, this monograph will still contain oversights, misinterpretations and outright errors, which are my own responsibility. I hope I will be corrected with love.

Gratia Dei, gratias Deo.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AHDLMA</i>	<i>Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen-âge</i>
<i>CCSL</i>	<i>Corpus Christianorum Series Latina</i>
<i>CSEL</i>	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i>
Leroquais	Victor Leroquais, <i>Les Psautiers manuscrits latins des bibliothèques publiques de France</i> 2 vols. (Macon, 1940–41)
Lesne, <i>Écoles</i>	Émile Lesne, <i>Histoire de la Propriété Ecclésiastique en France</i> , vol. 5: <i>Les Écoles de la fin du VIII^e siècle à la fin du XI^e siècle</i> (Lille, 1940)
<i>MARS</i>	<i>Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies</i>
<i>MGH SS</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica; Scriptores</i>
<i>Pierre Abelard</i>	<i>Pierre Abelard—Pierre le Vénérable. Les courants philosophiques, littéraire et artistiques . . . au milieu du XI^e siècle</i> , Actes et Mémoires du Colloque international du CNRS (1972), ed. René Louis, Jean Jolivet, Jean Châtillon (Paris, 1975)
<i>PL</i>	J. P. Migne, <i>Patrologia Latina</i>
<i>RTAM</i>	<i>Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale</i>
Smalley, <i>Study</i>	Beryl Smalley, <i>The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages</i> , 3rd ed., rev. bibliog. and Preface (Oxford, 1983)
Vaccari	P. A. Vaccari, "Il genuino commento ai Salmi di Remigio di Auxerre," <i>Biblica</i> 26 (1945): 52–99
Van Elswijk	H. C. van Elswijk, <i>Gilbert Porreta. Sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée</i> . <i>Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense</i> 33 (Louvain, 1966)

FOREWORD

GILBERT, WE HARDLY KNEW YE

Gilbert of Poitiers was more conventionally successful in his lifetime than was his flashier contemporary Abelard. A formidable scholar who drew grudging respect even from his adversaries, Gilbert's illustrious career was crowned by his appointment as bishop to the important diocese of Poitiers. His one brush with notoriety came when his views on the nature of the Trinity were examined before Pope Eugenius III at the Council of Reims in 1148; but in contrast to Abelard's experience eight years earlier, Gilbert left the council with career intact, successfully defending his orthodoxy against Saint Bernard of Clairvaux and an assembly of the most formidable theologians of the century. Gilbert's students, the *porretani* (so called after their master, who was known during his lifetime as Gilbert Porreta)¹ remained a vital and productive element in the schools; his great contemporaries Otto of Freising and John of Salisbury were among the many who held him in esteem.

In modern times—actually, since the thirteenth century—Gilbert's renown as a philosopher has effectively eclipsed his reputation as a biblical scholar. Gilbert's commentaries on the *Opuscula sacra* of Boethius (the source of those suspect teachings on the Trinity) have been carefully edited and subjected to painstaking analysis.² In contrast, the great enthusiasm with which Gilbert's own contemporaries studied and copied his biblical commentaries seems to have left modern scholarship unimpressed: the impact made by Gilbert's commentaries on the Psalms (ca. 1117) and on the Pauline Epistles (ca. 1130), together known as the *media glosatura*, has scarcely been noted. Recently Gilbert's commentary on the Epistles has been mined for

¹ His contemporaries usually referred to him as "Gilebertus Porretanus" or "Porreta", though he did not himself sign any surname in documents. He is also known as Gilbert de la Porrée, but that name does not seem to have much historical support. See F. Pelster, "Gilbert de la Porrée, Gilbertus Porretanus oder Gilbertus Porreta?" *Scholastik* 24 (1949): 401–403.

² There is an enormous bibliography dealing with Gilbert's philosophical writing. I will only mention the annotated edition by Gilbert's great promoter, the late Father Nikolaus M. Häring, *The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers*, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Studies and Texts 12 (Toronto, 1966).

nuggets of theological exposition of the Incarnation,³ but his earlier Psalms commentary, promising little in the way of knotty theological questions, remains unedited and almost completely unexplored.⁴

This omission leaves a serious gap in our understanding not only of Gilbert's own achievements, but also of the development of theology in the schools of the early twelfth century. Gilbert's Psalms commentary, completed shortly before 1117, displays an awareness of historical and literary context, a thematic unity, and a confidence in conceiving and carrying out a specific program of exposition, unequalled among his predecessors, and among the greatest of his generation. Yet his contribution to biblical scholarship has been overlooked because his commentary consistently has been dismissed as an unoriginal expansion of the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms; and besides, it is claimed, it was rapidly rendered obsolete and redundant by Peter Lombard's Psalms commentary. In other words, Gilbert's commentary has remained "unimportant" as long as modern scholarship has insisted on prejudging it according to its presumed relationship to other Scripture glosses, while ignoring the larger academic milieu in which Gilbert conceived of his gloss and for which he produced it.

In Gilbert's generation the study of the Psalter, along with the rest of the Bible, moved, in G. R. Evans' phrase, "from *lectio divina* to the lecture room".⁵ This is not to suggest that monastic scholars ceased

³ Lauge Olaf Nielsen, *Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century. A Study of Gilbert Porreta's Thinking and the Theological Expositions of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (Leiden, 1982). Nielson relies mostly on the commentaries on Boethius, much less on the Epistles commentary, and not at all on the Psalms commentary. See also Vincenzo Miano, "Il commento alle lettere di S. Paulo di Gilberto Porretano", *Scholastica: Ratione historico-critica instauranda*. Rome, Pontificium Athenaeum Antonianum, 1951.

⁴ The Prologue and the commentary for the first three Psalms have been published (not a critical edition, however) by Maria Fontana, "Il commento ai Salmi di Gilberto della Porrée," *Logos* 13 (1930): 283-301. The Prologue was again published, with an additional paragraph which is not by Gilbert, by Ada Pagliari, "Il presunto commento ai Salmi di S. Lorenzo Giustiniani opera di Gilberto Porretano," *Aevum* 36 (1962): 414-429 (the "presumption" was not widespread; the commentary has always been soundly attributed to Gilbert, though some individual manuscripts, such as the one in question here, have been misattributed). There is also one brief article devoted to analysis of the Psalms commentary: H. C. van Elswijk, "Gilbert Porreta als glossator van het Psalterium," in *Jubileumbundel voor G.P. Kreling, O.P.* (Nijmegen, 1953): 282-303.

⁵ G. R. Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology: The Beginnings of Theology as an Academic Discipline* (Oxford, 1980), 153: "[certain changes] took the student of the Bible from something not far removed from the *lectio divina* of the monastic schools to the university lecture room, where there was a syllabus to be covered, an order of treatment, and a certain amount of technical knowledge expected."

writing on the Psalms, nor that the study of *sacra pagina* was a new phenomenon in the schools, but rather that Gilbert and his colleagues were consciously occupied in the construction of a new academic discipline. His Psalms commentary reflects the considered response of a great scholar and teacher to the rapidly changing environment of scholarly activity. We shall see what prompted Gilbert's innovations, what made his commentary on the Psalms so popular, and how it reflected and contributed to the development of theology in the Middle Ages.

CHAPTER ONE

GILBERT'S ACADEMIC CAREER

In order to appreciate the pivotal position of Gilbert and his Psalms commentary within the theological enterprise of the twelfth century, one must know something about the educational milieu which produced both him and it. Unfortunately, before his appointment as bishop of Poitiers in 1141 or 1142,¹ only the broadest outlines of Gilbert's whereabouts and activities can be determined. The fact that precise details about Gilbert's years as student and teacher are almost entirely lacking, however, has not hindered interested parties from engaging in some highly speculative biographical reconstruction. Though much is still unknown (perhaps unknowable), enough unsubstantiated claims have been made for Gilbert's career that it is worthwhile to review the evidence, if only to disencumber ourselves of misleading preconceptions.

At the center of the inquiry is the relative importance of Laon, Chartres and Paris in Gilbert's academic formation and career. For present purposes this will serve to help identify the methods and interests which Gilbert assimilated and which are made manifest in his commentary on the Psalms. In a sense it will also mirror the importance of these schools in general during the first quarter of the twelfth century.

First of all, though a student of Anselm of Laon, Gilbert is rarely even considered as a representative, much less a principal exponent, of the "school of Laon"; the focus on Gilbert as a Chartrain philosopher has contributed to the obscurity in which his biblical exegesis has been left to molder.² The assumption that the Psalms commentary is a derivative, conservative work of Gilbert's callow youth has also discouraged scholars from giving the commentary their serious consideration. We should look again at Gilbert's association with Laon

¹ Gilbert's predecessor died on July 27 of 1141 or 1142. See H. C. Van Elswijk, *Gilbert Porreta. Sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée* (Louvain, 1966) 28.

² For example, though he recognizes that Anselm's fame was enough to draw Gilbert to Laon, J. de Ghellinck notes only Gilbert's Chartrain qualities; *Le Mouvement Théologique du XI^e Siècle*, 2nd ed. (Bruges, 1948), 133, 174.

in light of the evolution of the biblical glosses and sentence collections which were Laon's great contribution to the development of theology.

Secondly, Gilbert was one of the original pillars of the "school of Chartres" as delineated by Clerval and Poole, and remains one of the last supports of its crumbling glory;³ we must re-evaluate Gilbert's association with Chartres, as we will eventually want to consider how his commentary might reflect Chartres' 'humanist' and literary tradition.

Finally, Gilbert's association with Paris and its environs has been underestimated, resulting in a *cul-de-sac* for those scholars who have begun to suspect that Gilbert had a role in the promulgation—perhaps even the compilation—of the *Glossa ordinaria*, but who could not place him in the arena where the *Glossa* was apparently taking form.⁴

Gilbert's contemporaries agree that he was born in Poitiers, the city to which he returned as bishop in 1141 or 1142; regrettably, they neglect to tell us when.⁵ Figuring backwards from John of Salisbury's remark that Gilbert, at the time of the Council of Reims

³ The 25-year old controversy has tapered off, but has not been satisfactorily resolved. The founders of the idea that there was an intellectually distinct "School of Chartres" were R. L. Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought and Learning*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1920); "Masters of the Schools at Paris and at Chartres in John of Salisbury's Time", *English Historical Review* 35 (1920); reprinted in *Studies in Chronology and History*, 1934; all subsequent citations are to this edition; and A. Clerval, *Les Écoles de Chartres au Moyen Âge du V^e au XVI^e Siècle* (Chartres, 1895). The importance, even existence, of this "school" was challenged by R. W. Southern in his address to the Ecclesiastical History Society at Harvard in 1965, published as "Humanism and the School of Chartres" in *Medieval Humanism and Other Studies* (Oxford, 1970). Chartres was ably defended by Peter Dronke, "New Approaches to the School of Chartres," *Anuario de estudios medievales* 6 (1969), and by Nicholas M. Häring, "Chartres and Paris Revisited," *Essays in Honor of Anton Charles Pegis*, ed. J. Reginald O'Donnell (Toronto, 1974); but Southern returned to the attack in *Platonism, Scholastic Method and the School of Chartres* (Reading, 1979); "The Schools of Paris and the School of Chartres", given first in conference in 1977 and published in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, eds. Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable (Cambridge, Mass., 1982). See also R. Klibansky, "The School of Chartres," *Twelfth Century Europe and the Foundations of Modern Society*, ed. M. Clagett, et al. (Madison, 1961). Edouard Jeuneau, "*Lectio Philosophorum*": *Recherches sur l'École de Chartres* (Amsterdam, 1973); Roberto Giaccone, "Masters, Books and Library at Chartres According to the Cartularies of Notre-Dame and Saint Père," *Vivarium* 12 (1974). In the meantime, the "schools" of Laon, Reims, and elsewhere have come under fruitful scrutiny.

⁴ For example, Beryl Smalley, *Study*, Preface to 3rd ed. (1983) xi. See below chapter 5, p. 123.

⁵ Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici Imperatoris* 1:48 (MGH SS 20:376): "... ex eadem civitate oriundis, ab adolescentia usque ad ultimam senectutem in diversis Galliae locis philosophiae studium colens, re et nomine magistri officium administrarat noviterque ante hos dies ad culmen pontificale in prefata civitate sublimatus fuerat."

in 1148, had spent "about sixty years reading and threshing out letters (*circiter annos lx in legendo et tritura litterarum*),"⁶ and allowing both for the inclusion of his earliest schooling and a bit of hyperbole in this estimate, the date of Gilbert's birth might be placed around 1080; if only his serious schooling were meant, the date might be pushed back as much as a decade.⁷ This can be compared with the *Planctus* (*Lamentation*) written by Laurentius, dean of the cathedral chapter of Poitiers, on the occasion of Gilbert's death in 1154. Laurentius notes that his bishop "went to his rest at a considerable age, old and full of days (*dormivit . . . in senectute bona, senex et plenus dierum*)."⁸ Otto of Freising also notes that Gilbert died in "extreme old age (*ad ultimam senectutem*)."⁹ Accepting 1080 for Gilbert's birth would make him seventy-four at his death on September 4, 1154, exceeding the Psalmist's "threescore years and ten".

The rough outlines of Gilbert's academic trajectory can be traced as follows. Dean Laurentius assures us that Gilbert passed his boyhood steeping himself in the liberal arts and his youth in the discipline of philosophy, and finally, "when he had advanced in both age and wisdom", devoting himself to *lectio divina*, the study of Scripture.¹⁰ To this fairly conventional description, Otto of Freising adds corroborating details. He recounts that Gilbert studied under Hilary

Tr. and ed. C. C. Mierow as *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa* (New York, 1953). Confirmed in two elegies: "De commendatione magistri Gisleberti", MS Oxford, Magdalen Coll. 118, fol. 135v, ed. J. Leclercq, *AHDLM* 19 (1952) 184; and in the little epitaph at the end of MS Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal lat. 1117, fol. 394, given in its entirety by van Elswijk, *Gilbert Porreta*, 14n: "Pictavis hunc genuit quem pontificem sibi legit . . .".

⁶ John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis* c.8; ed. and tr. Marjorie Chibnall as *Memoirs of the Papal Court* (London, 1956) 15-16.

⁷ A. Berthaud gives Gilbert's birthdate as 1070; *Gilbert de la Porrée, évêque de Poitiers, et sa philosophie* (Poitiers, 1892); F. Vernet specifies "vers 1076" in his article "Gilbert de la Porrée," *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, ed. A. Vacant, E. Mangenot, E. Amann (Paris, 1947) vol. 2, col. 1350.

⁸ "Planctus Laurentii", ed. and tr. N. Häring, "Epitaphs and Necrologies on Bishop Gilbert II of Poitiers," *AHDLM* 36 (1969) 57-61 (translation), 68-72 (edition). Häring gives information on earlier editions. Though the words Laurentius uses refer originally to Abraham (Gen. 25:8), we cannot assume that Gilbert, like the patriarch, was 175 years old.

⁹ See note 5 above.

¹⁰ "Si ad prima illius rudimenta recurrimus, pueriles annos subdidit inuendos liberalibus artibus, iuvenilem etatem philosophicis disciplinis. Ubi vero profecit etate et sapientia, et ad capessanda maiora latioris intelligentie sinum laxavit, ad lectionem divinam totum se contulit. Hec fuit eius cura continua . . ." "Planctus Laurentii," ed. Häring, "Epitaphs" 69 (transl. 59).

while in Poitiers, under Bernard in Chartres, and with the brothers Anselm and Ralph in Laon.¹¹

While Bernard of Chartres and the brothers in Laon are well known, Otto's reference to Hilary elicited expressions of doubt from modern scholars. Both Hauréau and R. L. Poole were of the opinion that Otto was either confused or was indulging in some poetic license, and that the meaning of the passage was that Gilbert was particularly indebted and devoted to Saint Hilary (d. 368), the first great bishop of Poitiers, from whose writings Gilbert was inclined to quote by heart.¹² Van Elswijk suspected that Otto could hardly have been so misinformed; his faith in Otto's accuracy was vindicated in 1965, when Häring showed that there was indeed a Hilary, "master of the schools," demonstrably active in Poitiers between 1105–1121 and thus eligible to have been a teacher of Gilbert.¹³ This piece of evidence provides us with a (rare) time frame for Gilbert's study there. It is thus apparent that Gilbert had already completed his elementary education in Poitiers before he began to work, about the age of twenty-five, with master Hilary, presumably at the cathedral school.¹⁴

The nature and subjects of his already advanced studies with Hilary cannot be specified. Despite Laurentius' conventional account of Gilbert's academic *cursus* (his boyhood pursuit of the liberal arts and

¹¹ *Gesta*, 1:52; tr. Mierow 88.

¹² Hauréau, *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique* vol. 1 (Paris, 1872), 448; R. L. Poole, *Illustrations*, 113. Philip of Harvengt recounts a discussion he had with Gilbert in Paris, concerning St. Hilary's writings on the Trinity, in the course of which the bishop "totius principium operis memoriter duxit ad medium"; "Epistola V", *PL* 203:45–46. Otto confirms this predilection: *Gesta* 1:55 and 58 (tr. Mierow 93, 97).

¹³ A certain "Salomon" was *magister scolae* up to 1104: Nikolaus M. Häring, "Zur Geschichte der Schulen von Poitiers im 12. Jahrhundert," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 47 (1965): 26–29; Van Elswijk, *Gilbert Porreta*, 16. Berthaud accepted Otto at his word, as Häring notes, 26; É. Lesne provides cartulary evidence for a Hilary, "*magister scholarum*" in Poitiers, but does not signal him as a teacher of Gilbert; van Elswijk appears to have missed this; *Histoire de la Propriété Ecclésiastique en France* vol. 5 *Les Ecoles* (Lille, 1940) 71. Charters spanning the years 1105–1121 witnessed by "*Hilarius magister scholarum*" and Hilary with other titles are discussed in Lesne and in Häring. Later charters mention a "*Hilarius [cantor] capericus*"; it is unclear whether this might be the same Hilary, perhaps semi-retired.

¹⁴ Poitiers was rich in important ecclesiastical foundations, and their schools. Lesne remarks two simultaneous "*magistri Pictavensibus*", in addition to Hilary, in a charter of 1112, and assumes that each was a master of a different church school; *Histoire*, 70, 77; Häring accepts this: "Zur Geschichte der Schulen," 28. These others, however, are indicated simply as "*magistri*", not "*magister scolae/scholarum*", so it is not impossible that they were masters under Hilary at the cathedral. That Hilary himself taught at the cathedral school is clear, since he signs under the rubric "*canonici Beati Petri matricis ecclesiae Pictavensis*" in 1107: Häring, 28.

his study of philosophy as a young man), Gilbert might well already have studied philosophy with Hilary, just as he surely returned to advanced studies of grammar later on in Chartres; masters and students at this time, long before the institutional fixing of curricula, moved easily back and forth between disciplines.¹⁵ Whatever Gilbert was studying there, it is a tribute to the unsung Hilary and to the attractions of Poitiers that a serious student like Gilbert delayed so long his departure for some of the most famous centers of learning in France.

In leaving his native Poitou to seek knowledge where it could be found, Gilbert joined the growing throngs of ambitious students who were on the move. *Terra aliena* was, it seems, a prerequisite for advanced study: having exhausted the fund of wisdom in their local schools, the would-be great scholars of the twelfth century sought out the rare master whose reputation had reached across geographic and political boundaries.¹⁶ Increasingly, *terra aliena* found itself situated north of the Loire, in the vicinity of the Ile de France, where intensifying political and economic vitality was encouraging to the pursuit of knowledge.¹⁷

After an indeterminate period of working with Hilary, then, Gilbert proceeded to Chartres to study with the illustrious Bernard. Again, details are frustratingly absent regarding the subjects he studied there and the duration of his stay. We can only surmise that he remained in Chartres long enough to complete his mastery of "all the liberal arts except astronomy," as one eulogy puts it.¹⁸ These fuzzy indications

¹⁵ P. Delhay, "L'origins scolaires au XII^e siècle," *Traditio* 5 (1947) 261 and *passim*. Note, for example, the fact that John of Salisbury still worked on rhetoric at three different times in his academic career, pursuing courses on grammar, logic and the *quadrivium* in between: *Metalogicon* 2:10, ed. Cl. C. Webb, (Oxford, 1929). Gilbert himself taught a variety of subjects; see below, p. 15.

¹⁶ John of Salisbury reports a verse he attributes to Bernard of Chartres: "Mens humilis, studium quaerendi, vita quieta / scrutinium tacitum, paupertas, terra aliena" (*Policraticus* 7:13). Hugh of St. Victor refers to the same verses; *PL* 176:773.

¹⁷ This was just as true for students from Germany and England as from France: Joachim Ehlers, "Deutsche Scholaren in Frankreich während des 12. Jahrhunderts," *Schulen und Studium im sozialen Wandel des hohen und späten Mittelalters*, vol. 30 of *Vorträge und Forschungen* (Sigmaringen, 1986) 106–109; P. Riché, "Jean et le monde scolaire du XII^e siècle," *The World of John of Salisbury*, ed. M. Wilks (Oxford, 1984) 39–41. See also J. Boussard, *Nouvelle Histoire de Paris: de la fin du siège de 885–886 à la mort de Philippe Auguste* (Paris, 1976) esp. 197; de Ghellinck, *Mouvement Théologique*, 126.

¹⁸ The epitaph following MS Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal lat. 1117 (see above, n. 5): "Logicus, ethicus hic, theologicus atque sophista / Solaque de septem cui defuit astronomia / Artibus, ac diva precelsus philosophia . . ."

aside, we do know that Gilbert was there long enough to be reputed a student of Bernard, who was renowned as the greatest grammarian of his time. As we shall see, the Chartrain emphasis on the study of the classics and the classical commentators will prove to be of greater importance to the understanding of Gilbert's Psalms commentary than anything else Chartres had to offer. The glosses which had been developed to teach advanced grammar and rhetoric via Livy, Cicero, Priscian and Donatus, employed particular pedagogical techniques, such as the use of marginal references and instructive prologues, for which Gilbert was to find a novel application.¹⁹

Finally, after another indeterminate period of study, Gilbert found himself in Laon, studying *lectio divina* with Anselm, widely acclaimed as the premier theologian of his day. Though conservative in his own way, suspicious of using dialectic, for example, to answer questions the Fathers knew enough to leave alone, Anselm directed a school which attracted and influenced an entire generation of theologians.²⁰ The sheer numbers of students at the thriving cathedral school encouraged the exchange of ideas and prompted pedagogical advances in the teaching of theology. Anselm and his brother Ralph, also a master in the cathedral school, and their colleagues and disciples had undertaken an enormous task, a visionary endeavor: to provide sets of glosses to all the books of the Bible, which would be suitable for use in the classrooms. The number of manuscripts of glossed biblical books which recent research has associated with Laon gives fresh support to our appreciation of Anselm's goal and the efficiency of his team.²¹ This, and the emphasis on the practical, pastoral aspects of theology, to the disadvantage (but not the exclusion) of speculative inquiry, was the hallmark of Anselm's school at Laon.

Even when it comes to Gilbert's apprenticeship with Anselm of

¹⁹ See R. W. Hunt's groundbreaking article "Studies on Priscian in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* 1 (1941-1943): 194-231, 2 (1950): 1-55; also, Philippe Delhay, "L'Enseignement de la Philosophie Morale au XII^e Siècle," *Mediaeval Studies* 11 (1949): 77-99.

²⁰ Beryl Smalley notes that "almost every contemporary theologian of any standing" attended Laon in the years around 1100; *Study*, 49. Known students of Anselm include Alberic of Reims, Gilbert the Universal, William of Champeaux, and Abelard (briefly); Anselm of Havelberg studied with Ralph. See also G. Paré, A. Brunet and P. Tremblay, *La Renaissance du XII^e Siècle. Les écoles et l'enseignement* (Paris, 1933) 24; de Ghellinck, *Mouvement Théologique*, 133.

²¹ Patricia Stürnemann, "Où ont été fabriqués les livres de la glose ordinaire dans la première moitié du XII^e siècle?" *Le XII^e siècle: Mutations et renouveau en France dans la première moitié du XII^e siècle* (Paris, 1994), 257-264.

Laon, however, we are without firm dates. We can only say that Gilbert's sojourn in Laon was of sufficient duration to allow him to become proficient enough in *lectio divina* to produce an exegetical work of the sophistication of his commentary on the Psalter. We will examine in more detail later the evidence for the date of Gilbert's commentary; in brief, there is a colophon which follows Gilbert's commentary in an early manuscript, which states that Gilbert "recited" his commentary in Anselm's presence in order that it might be "corrected".²² This suggests both that the commentary was completed before Anselm's death in 1117, and that Gilbert had attained a position at Laon which allowed him to lecture on Scripture. Anselm was understandably chary about letting students lecture on important books; there was always the very real danger that any errors made by his student would be imputed to him, the *magister*; it was a risk that Gilbert himself was to run in his own career.²³ In addition there was the question of professional rivalry; the rights to teach and to appoint teachers were jealously guarded privileges, and competition flourished only where local exceptions broke the monopoly of the cathedral school.²⁴ Both of these considerations had prompted an anxious Anselm to put an abrupt halt to Abelard's unauthorized lectures on the notoriously difficult book of Ezechiel, with which the Peripatetic of Pallet had flaunted his disdain for the traditional methods of Anselm's school.²⁵ On the other hand, it was probably customary for the master to grant the privilege of lecturing, under his own watchful eye, to a mature and serious disciple who was ready to embark on his teaching career.²⁶ After all, Gilbert was probably in his mid-thirties, and had spent at least twelve years in serious studies by the time of Anselm's death.

²² "Explicit glosatura magistri Giliberti Porretani super psalterium quam ipse recitavit coram suo magistro Anselmo causa emendationis." MS Oxford, Balliol 36, fol. 145v. Cited in van Elswijk, *Gilbert Porreta* 23; R. A. B. Mynors, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Balliol College* (Oxford, 1963), 26. The manuscript dates from before 1166, when Bishop Robert of Chesney willed it to the chapter of Lincoln Cathedral. The date of the commentary will be discussed in chapter 2.

²³ John of Salisbury reports that Gilbert, at the Consistory of Reims, complained that two of his former students were misrepresenting his teachings: "I avow that I have several pupils who admittedly have heard me lecture, though some of them have not understood a word I said; what they have written is their interpretation, not my meaning." *Historia Pontificalis* c.10; ed. and tr. Chibnall, p. 22.

²⁴ Lesne, *Les Écoles*, 422-425, 473-474. See also Stephen Ferruolo, *The Origins of the University: The Schools of Paris and their Critics, 1110-1215* (Stanford, 1985), 20.

²⁵ Abelard recounts this episode in *Historia Calamitatum*, PL 179:125.

²⁶ See van Elswijk, *Gilbert Porreta*, 23.

It is generally repeated as fact that Gilbert left Laon to teach in his home town of Poitiers about the time of Anselm's death in 1117.²⁷ There is, however, no real evidence to substantiate this claim. Bearing the burden of proof of Gilbert's teaching activity in Poitiers by 1116 is a problematic letter included in a collection of epistles of Ivo of Chartres (d. 1115) and some of his contemporaries.²⁸ The letter in question is by a certain "G" who writes from Aquitaine where he is directing the schools to his beloved and sorely-missed "lord and master B" who is presumably not only *in* Chartres (where the letters were collected) but also *of* Chartres (as in "Bernard of Chartres"). In the course of the letter, "G" heaps fulsome praise on "B", deploring their separation and hinting (or so interpret most commentators) at a post in Chartres.²⁹ For over a century, it has been assumed that the correspondents must necessarily be Gilbert and his former teacher Bernard, an identification which served to support the increasingly overbuilt structure of the "School of Chartres" by seeming to affirm its central importance in Gilbert's mind and career. Then, in the opening engagement of the School of Chartres controversy, R. W. Southern cautioned that not every "G" was a Gilbert, and doubted that the "raving young admirer" who enthuses so humbly in the letter was likely to be the grave and mature theologian whose major opus thus far had been written, not under Bernard, but under Anselm of Laon.³⁰ In the meantime, unaware of Southern's iconoclastic lecture until it was published five years later, Father Häring tranquilly noted that a certain Guillelmus, who appears in several Poitevin charters between 1090 and 1112 as *magister*

²⁷ A. Clerval, *Les Écoles de Chartres*, 164; Poole, "Masters of the Schools", 228. More recently, van Elswijk, *Gilbert Porreta*, 23-24: "before 1117"; Nielsen, *Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century. A Study of Gilbert Porreta's Thinking and the Theological Expositions of the Doctrine of the Incarnation during the Period 1130-1180* (Leiden, 1982), 28: "before Anselm's death"; Häring, "Zur Geschichte der Schulen," 25: "after Anselm's death".

²⁸ L. Merlet, ed. *Lettres d'Yves de Chartres et d'autres personnages de son temps* (Paris, 1855), 461. Brief confusion over which period of "Gilbert's" life this letter supposedly reflects was resolved when Clerval (*Les Écoles de Chartres*, 164) decided that it had to have been written contemporaneously with the other letters in the collection, *i.e.* before 1116; whence the "discovery" that Gilbert had taught in Poitiers: Poole, "Masters of the Schools", 228: "It now becomes clear that . . . he went back to his first home, Poitiers, as master of the schools . . ."

²⁹ For example van Elswijk: "Manière à peine déguisée de poser sa candidature pour une chaire à l'École qui a toujours retenu sa préférence"; *Gilbert Porreta*, 24.

³⁰ Southern, "Humanism and the School of Chartres," 70-71.

scolarum, *magister scolae* and *magister pictavensis* better fit the circumstances of the letter than did Gilbert.³¹

Poole had recognized that this anonymous letter was "the only basis for the supposition that Gilbert returned to Poitiers before he was made bishop" there in 1142.³² The only other evidence of a Gilbert in Poitiers at the right time is a single charter, drawn up in 1121 by order of bishop William of Poitiers for Saint-Maur-sur-Loire, which is witnessed by a certain Gilbert, who signs as canon of the cathedral of Saint-Pierre—not, it should be noted, with the prestigious title *magister* or *magister scolae*, which, one expects, would be employed if applicable. No other Gilberts, master or otherwise, appear in the charters of the decade in question. While this negative evidence does not definitively preclude the possibility that Gilbert returned to Poitiers, it certainly dashes Clerval's romantic notion that he founded a school there, and leaves Poole's references to Gilbert as "master of the schools" completely undocumented. The solitary appearance of "canon Gilbert" is in fact woefully anemic evidence with which to nourish a claim of nearly a decade of teaching in Poitiers, and we are permitted to doubt whether this canon is our Gilbert at all. Gilbert might just as well have continued to work with Ralph (d. ca. 1137) after the death of Anselm, launching his teaching career in Laon. It is even tempting to speculate that Gilbert might have begun his other great biblical commentary, that on the Pauline Epistles, while still in residence at the alma mater of so many of the generation's leading exegetes and theologians.³³ Perhaps we are better off admitting ignorance of Gilbert's whereabouts at this time.

At last, back in Chartres, a light snowfall of cartulary evidence softens the barren landscape of our speculation. By 1124 Gilbert had certainly returned to Chartres, for a charter attests to his presence as a canon of Notre Dame; his name appears immediately below that of the chancellor Bernard.³⁴ By 1126 Gilbert had been promoted to the chancellorship, witnessing charters in that capacity five times between 1126 and 1137.³⁵ John of Salisbury mentions that Gilbert

³¹ Häring, "Zur Geschichte der Schulen," 25 n. 9.

³² Poole, "Masters of the Schools," 228.

³³ See n. 20 above.

³⁴ *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de St-Père de Chartres*, ed. M. Guérard (?Chartres, 1840). "Gislebertus canonicus" signs twice: in the years 1124 (2:469) and 1126 (2:264).

³⁵ *Cart. de l'abbaye de St-Père de Chartres*, ed. M. Guérard (?Chartres, 1840); *Cart. de Notre-Dame de Chartres*, 3 vols., ed. E. de Lépiniois, L. Merlet (Chartres, 1862–1865);

was chancellor when he knew him, and the obituary of Chartres confirms that Gilbert was first a canon and then chancellor of the cathedral chapter.³⁶

While the colophon of the Balliol manuscript mentioned above suggests that Gilbert lectured on the Psalms in Laon, his teaching activity in Chartres has become something of a bone of contention as each side of the "School of Chartres" controversy attempts to secure students of Gilbert for either his Paris or his Chartres sojourn. As a result of the skirmishing, instigated by Southern's challenge that "there is a striking absence of pupils who can be shown to have studied under him during those years [at Chartres]",³⁷ a respectable number of students have been marshalled under Gilbert's aegis, and some revealing anecdotes about Gilbert's classroom persona have been turned up. Most of these, alas for the Chartres backers, relate to Gilbert's Paris experience. The three most serious indications that Gilbert may have taught in Chartres will be considered here.

The first clue is that Gilbert was, since 1126, chancellor of the cathedral chapter. In Clerval's opinion, teaching was the primary duty of the chancellor, but this is far from being an established fact. It is impossible to tell exactly what comprised the duties of the chancellor of Chartres, since the office's attributes differed from chapter to chapter, and the manuscripts and papers concerning the Chartres chancellery were lost in the Revolution.³⁸ Certainly, in addition to handling the business of the chapter and supervising the fabric of

Cart. de Notre-Dame de Josaphat, ed. Ch. Métais (Chartres, 1911). Charters are witnessed by "Gislebertus cancellarius" in November 1126 (*St-Père* 2:267); somewhere between 1124–1127 (*Josephat* 1:30); February 1133 (*Notre-Dame* 1:142); 1136 or 1137 (*St-Père* 2:506); 1137 (*Josephat* 1:127). The fact that "Gilbert" signs both as canon and as chancellor on the same day (November 27, 1126; *St-Père* 2:264 and 2:267) suggests either that that was the day of Gilbert's promotion, or that there was another Gilbert who was also canon (Gilbert was a common name); of course, it could also be an error in transcription.

³⁶ John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon* I:5; more on this passage below. *Cartulaire de Notre Dame de Chartres* 3, 167: "Obiit Gislebertus primum canonicus huius ecclesie, postea cancellarius litteratissimus, postea venerabilis Pictavorum episcopus . . ." Also ed. Nikolaus M. Häring, "Epitaphs and Necrologies on Bishop Gilbert II of Poitiers," *AHDLM* 36 (1969): 74.

³⁷ "Humanism and the School of Chartres," 71.

³⁸ Catalogue indications tell us only that the chancellery was not a "dignity" but only a simple "office". "Enfin, il parait que le Chancelier avait la police de la librairie et la surveillance des écrivains": Auguste de Santeul, *La Tresor de Notre-Dame de Chartres. Rapport à M. le Ministre de l'Intérieur sur les archives de l'ancien chapitre de la cathédral de Chartres* (Chartres, 1841), 30–31.

the cathedral, the chancellor was to look after the library and archives; Gilbert acquitted himself splendidly in that area, his Chartres obituary noting appreciatively that he greatly improved the volumes in the cathedral's armarium.³⁹ The chancellor also had jurisdiction over educational activities in his diocese, maintaining the church's monopoly over teaching and its revenues, and probably approving if not appointing the masters of the school(s) in his jurisdiction.⁴⁰

But did the chancellor necessarily teach? Klibansky argues that not only did he teach, but the chancellor of Chartres in particular, since 1115, "took complete charge of the teaching," handing over his traditional duties to the *magister scolae*.⁴¹ He offers no documentation for this rather startling allegation, except to note that Bernard, Gilbert, Thierry, and John of Salisbury were all famous teachers as well as chancellors of Chartres. He does not mention that except for Gilbert, these were, typically, all appointed chancellor quite late in their careers. Lesne had suggested that indeed the responsibility of directing the schools had passed from the *magister* or *scolasticus* to the chancellor, while the former often witnessed charters in place of the latter; but as for the chancellor's teaching duties, Lesne stresses that the post was frequently filled by a "former master".⁴² Peter Dronke helpfully points out that, regardless, the chancellor's intellectual influence on the *magistri* and *canonici* would be substantial: "he will talk with them at meals, and they are likely to be influenced by his ideas", much like the head of a Cambridge college who has "come to his new appointment from a teaching chair in another town".⁴³

Even assuming that he did teach, was teaching the main occupation of the chancellor? A letter written home by a student at Laon seems to imply that it was not: "I give you this advice, that if you or any of your neighbors are thinking of coming here to profit from [the teaching of] master Anselm, you should come as quickly as you can, for it is doubtful if he will long have leisure to devote to clerks,

³⁹ *Cart. de Notre-Dame de Chartres*, vol. 3:167; Paré, Brunet and Tremblay, *Renaissance du XII^e siècle*, 87.

⁴⁰ Lesne, *Les Écoles*, 476–477; cf. Southern, "Schools of Paris and the School of Chartres," 120 and nn. 14–16.

⁴¹ Southern, "Humanism and the School of Chartres," 4.

⁴² Lesne, *Les Écoles*, 477. In Paris, Odo of Ourscamp, Peter Comestor, Hilduin, Peter of Poitiers and Prevostin of Cremona were chancellors who had been "former masters" in Paris: Stephen C. Ferruolo, *Origins of the University: The Schools of Paris and their Critics, 1110–1215* (Stanford, 1985), 189.

⁴³ Dronke, "New Approaches to the School of Chartres," 119.

and you may have come in vain if you delay."⁴⁴ Anselm was made chancellor in 1113 (also, in fact, toward the end of his long career), and his administrative duties as dean had already hindered his scholarly pursuits; Peter the Chanter invites his readers to join his regret that the demands on Anselm's time, imposed by official and unofficial business of the chapter, had impeded him from completing his proposed set of glosses on the entire Bible.⁴⁵

On the other hand, what we can make out of Gilbert's career seems to suggest that at Chartres, at least, the chancellor's duties were not so onerous as to preclude other activities such as teaching. Between 1126 and 1137 we only have his signature five times in Chartres documents; evidently the chancellor's presence as witness could be dispensed with, or deputized, without arousing surprise or protest. In fact, the gaps in the calendar of Gilbert's signatures are not inconsistent with long periods of absence from Chartres altogether. Evidence from other sources indicates that the office of chancellor, like other positions in the cathedral hierarchy, had a history of non-residency, since legislation was passed to prohibit abuses.⁴⁶

In short, all we can deduce from the fact of Gilbert's chancellorship was that it apparently did not compel him to teach in Chartres,

⁴⁴ "De vobis vero vobis consulo quatinus, si vobis vel aliquibus vicinis vestris in proposita est adhuc magistro Anselmo frui, illum quam citius poteritis adeatis, ne tandem eum, quem dubium est diu vacare clericis, tarde aut frustra queratis." L. Merlet, *Lettres d'Yves de Chartres*, 466; cited and translated in Southern, "Schools of Paris and the School of Chartres," 116.

⁴⁵ "Unde lugere adhuc debemus super hoc quod magister Anselmus non permittebatur perfecte glosare omnem sacram paginam, sicut incepit, quia canonici quorum erat decanus, et alii plures eum ab illo studio amoverunt sepe, vel litigando scil. propter lites suas, vel honorando per adulationem, vel pauperes opprimando, quorum necessitatibus exigebatur interesse, vel persequendo, quando scil. compellebant eum interesse negotiis capituli sui." From Peter's Psalms commentary, MS Paris Bibl. Nat. lat. 12011, fol. 173v, cited in Smalley, "La Glosa Ordinaria. Quelques prédécesseurs d'Anselms de Laon," *RTAM* 9 (1937): 400n. Anselm was made dean in 1106, archdeacon in 1115; O. Lottin, *Psychologie et morale aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles*, vol. 5: *Problèmes d'histoire littéraire. L'école d'Anselme de Laon et de Guillaume de Champeaux* (Gembloux, 1959).

⁴⁶ *Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis* ed. H. Denifle and É. Chatelain (Paris, 1889–1897) vol. 1:65–66: "Statuimus in capitulo Parisiensi ut quicumque de cetero cancellarius Parisiensis fuerit, teneatur in persona propria bona fide Parisius residere, et post institutionem suam teneatur iuramentum in capitulo exhibere, se facturum residentiam bona fide in ecclesia Parisiensi, quamdiu cancellarium tenuerit," etc. Cited in Southern, "Schools of Paris," 126 n. 35. The office of archdeacon also was vulnerable to absenteeism: Robert Pullen, archdeacon of Rochester since 1134, spent his time teaching in Paris; when his bishop demanded he either return or resign, Bernard of Clairvaux (of all people) successfully interceded for him, and Robert

any more than it prevented him from teaching there—or elsewhere.

The question would be resolved if we could but name a single student who studied with Gilbert in Chartres while he held the office of chancellor. Two names have been proposed: that of John of Salisbury, and that of the less famous Everard of Ypres. There are, however, problems with both candidates.

John of Salisbury is, perhaps, Gilbert's most famous student, and certainly the one with the greatest likelihood of having studied with Gilbert in Chartres. John's account of his studies in *Metalogicon* 2:10, however, is a long and rambling reminiscence, riddled with the most frustrating omissions and the laxest attitude toward chronology.⁴⁷

John tells us that, upon arriving in France from England (around 1136), he studied logic for two years on Mont Sainte-Geneviève with Abelard, Alberic and Robert of Melun. Then, as an antidote to the feeling of omniscience he had acquired there (*"videbar michi sciolus,"* he admits; "I considered myself a know-it-all") he "transferred" (he does not specify where) to hear the lectures of William of Conches (*"transtuli . . . ad gramaticum de Conchis"*), a three year period which, he vows, he would never regret.

It is at this point that the narrative, and the geography, become confusing. John tells us that after his three years with William (where?), he studied with five masters, four of whom we associate with Paris:⁴⁸ but he tells us neither when nor where these studies took place. Southern and others have suggested that all five of the masters

retained both his teaching career and his benefice. Ferruolo, *Origins of the University*, 193. Southern gives more examples of masters teaching in one city while holding office in another (Peter Comestor, Clarembald of Arras; "The Schools of Paris," 125–126).

⁴⁷ *Metalogicon* 2:10; ed. Cl. C. Webb (Oxford, 1929; reprint, Frankfurt am Main, 1965), 78–83. Translated by Daniel D. McGarry as *The Metalogicon. A Twelfth-Century Defense of the Verbal and Logical Arts of the Trivium* (Berkeley, 1955). Some attempts to make sense out of John's account: R. L. Poole, "Masters of the Schools," 235–240; Hans Liebeschütz, *Mediaeval Humanism in the Life and Writings of John of Salisbury*, vol. 17 of *Studies of the Warburg Institute* (London, 1950), 111–113; H. Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, new ed. F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden (Oxford, 1936) vol. 3, 66–68; Southern, "Humanism and the School of Chartres," 72–73; Dronke, "New Approaches to the School of Chartres," 122–123; Olga Weijers, "The Chronology of John of Salisbury's Studies in France (*Metalogicon*, II.10)," *The World of John of Salisbury*, ed. Michael Wilks (Oxford, 1984), 109–116.

⁴⁸ After stating that he studied three years with William, John says that "afterwards (*postmodum*)" he reviewed with Richard 'the Bishop' what he had earlier studied with Harduin the German (*quadrivium*) and Thierry (*rhetoric*); "later (*postea*)", he pursued rhetoric again with Peter Helias; and at some point he reviewed much of his early studies with Adam of the Petit-Pont.

mentioned in this segment, in addition to William of Conches and Gilbert, who had been presumed to be in Chartres, were in fact to be found in Paris during those three years.⁴⁹ Southern manages this by reminding us that “a man could leave Mont Sainte-Geneviève to go, not away from, but into Paris.”⁵⁰ While this is not implausible, Liebeschütz, and more recently Weijers, have argued that the list of Parisian masters which John introduces with “*postmodum*” is actually a digression based on “an association of ideas”,⁵¹ and has neither chronological nor topological identity with John’s study with William of Conches, who is thus not (necessarily) in Paris. Where then did John study with William? Chartres was proffered as the obvious locale, on the strength of John’s alleged acquaintance with Bernard and Gilbert there.⁵²

At the end of three years, John continues, he “returned” (from wherever he had been) and “met again” with Gilbert⁵³ (whom, therefore, John must have met somewhere already). John’s lessons in logic and theology with Gilbert were brief, for the master was called from Paris to the episcopacy of Poitiers in 1141 or 1142. The crux of the problem is the word “*repperi*”. Where had John previously known Gilbert? It is usually assumed that John had studied with Gilbert in Chartres at the time of his three years of work with William of Conches, though if this were true it would be somewhat surprising that John would not say so. The fact that John elsewhere reports a

⁴⁹ Southern, “Schools of Paris,” 129–130.

⁵⁰ This had been the prevailing view before Schaarschmidt sent John to Chartres. Southern, “Humanism and the School of Chartres,” 73. John could well have studied under William of Conches in Paris; William’s epitaph suggests that he died there, and Jeaneau has pointed out references to Paris as well as to Chartres in William’s commentery on Priscian: E. Jeaneau, “Deux redactions des gloses de Guillaume de Conches sur Priscien,” *RTAM* 27 (1960): 212–247. See Häring, “Chartres and Paris Revisited,” 294–295. M. Vieillard-Troiekouroff emphasises that Mont Sainte-Geneviève was decidedly, physically “*extra civitatem*”: “L’église Sainte-Geneviève de Paris du temps d’Abélard,” *Pierre Abélard—Pierre le Vénérable* (Paris, 1975), 745.

⁵¹ Liebeschütz, *Mediaeval Humanism*, 111; he spells out the sequence of associations clearly and convincingly.

⁵² Ironically, Schaarschmidt uses Gilbert to secure William in Chartres, on the basis of *Metalogicon* 1:5; *Johannis Sarasberiensis*, 22. John’s vivid portrait of Bernard of Chartres once led scholars to believe that they were master and student. By the time R. L. Poole was writing, it was known that Bernard was dead long before John ever left England; but once having got John to Chartres on Bernard’s account, supporters of the School were reluctant to let him leave.

⁵³ “*Reversus itaque in fine trienii repperi magistrum Gilebertum, ipsumque audiui in logicis et divinis . . .*” It has to be the same “*triennium*” as the three years with William, (*i.e.* not an additional three years) because John must be back in Paris to study with Gilbert before 1141–1142.

caustic *bon mot* of Gilbert, who was "at that time chancellor of Chartres and afterwards the bishop of Poitiers," seems to indicate that John at least knew Gilbert while in Chartres.⁵⁴ But the anecdote—concerning Gilbert's derisive dismissal of mercenary students—is repeated by John in context of a diatribe against the 'Cornificians', who were a phenomenon by no means confined to Chartres; the other anti-Cornificians praised by John were teaching all over, especially in Paris. John also mentions Thierry (then in Chartres or in Paris?), William of Conches (same question), Abelard (Paris and elsewhere), Anselm and Ralph (Laon), Alberic of Reims, Simon of Paris, William of Champeaux (Paris and St-Victor), Hugh (St-Victor) and Robert Pullen (Paris).⁵⁵ We have already noted that to be a chancellor of Chartres (or Paris or anyplace) one need not necessarily reside primarily in that town. It is not stretching the meaning of the passage in the least to observe that John lends credibility to the point he is making (concerning the Cornificians) by emphasizing the status of his *auctoritas*: Gilbert is recognized by rank, as chancellor and then as bishop. He would have been identified as chancellor of Chartres whether he were at that moment in Chartres or in Paris, so this passage cannot be used a proof positive that John knew Gilbert when they were both in Chartres.

But if John had not studied with Gilbert in Chartres, why does he say he "met again" with Gilbert on his return, in 1141, from a three-year absence from Mont Sainte-Geneviève? If Southern is right, and John spent those three years in the schools in Paris proper, then the answer is simple: John made Gilbert's acquaintance, perhaps even followed his lectures, in Paris; he then encountered Gilbert again when he returned to pursue courses on the Mont. This is not unimaginable, since we know Gilbert taught logic and grammar as well as theology,⁵⁶ and the dialecticians seemed to congregate on Mont Sainte-Geneviève.

More likely, perhaps, John really did return from studying in

⁵⁴ "Solebat magister Gilebertus, tunc quidem cancellarius Carnotensis et postmodum venerabilis episcopus Pictavorum, temporis eius nescio ridens aut dolens insaniam, cum eos [Cornificians] videbat ad studia, que predicta sunt, evolare, eis artem pistariam polliceri; quoniam illa est, ut aiebat, in gente sua que sola accipere consuevit omnes aliis operibus aut artificio destitutos; ars enim facillime exercetur et subsidaria est aliarum, presertim apud eos qui panem potius quam artificium querunt." *Metalogicon* 1:5 (Webb, 16; tr. McGarry, 21) Gilbert says, in effect, that if the students want "bread", let them bake cakes.

⁵⁵ *Metalogicon* 1 (Webb, 16–18; tr. McGarry, 21–23).

⁵⁶ John himself studied logic with Gilbert; for Gilbert as *gramaticus*, see below p. 21.

Chartres, but it still is not necessary that he met Gilbert there. There is nothing to keep us from suggesting that John had met him already before he left Paris to go to Chartres; as it is, Poole had to stretch the cartulary evidence to keep Gilbert in Chartres long enough for John to have met him there.⁵⁷ If Gilbert had been resident in Chartres during John's three years there, and teaching subjects typically Chartrain, surely John would have included Gilbert's name in the list of masters in the liberal arts whom he associates with William of Conches. Gilbert might well have been commuting between Chartres and Paris for years before he was appointed bishop. It was apparently normal for masters to come and go suddenly, called by official or private business, and for students, resigned to this unsettling state of affairs, simply to try to take advantage of whatever masters were present.⁵⁸

In the final analysis, John's account in the *Metalogican* certifies that Gilbert taught logic and theology in Paris (and, just perhaps, Mont Sainte-Geneviève), but proves nothing concerning Gilbert's teaching activity in Chartres. Unless new evidence comes in, we may never be able to determine the location of John's three year absence from Mont Sainte-Geneviève, and we hesitate to ground Gilbert in Chartres on the basis of John of Salisbury's ambiguous testimony.

The third supposed piece of evidence to support Gilbert's teaching career in Chartres is the fascinating *Dialogus Ratii et Everardi*,⁵⁹ a curious mixture of dramaturgy and theological debate. If the internal

⁵⁷ R. L. Poole, "Masters of the Schools," 236. He assumes that the chancellor was permanently in residence. See also Southern, "Schools of Paris and the School of Chartres," 125 and n. 31, where he reviews the question and lists the cartulary sources.

⁵⁸ For example, William of Tyre mentions several of his former masters, then recalls: "Hos alternatim, secundum quod eorum negocia presentes eos nobis permittebant vel absentes, annis audivimus circiter decem. (For about ten years we listened to them alternately, according to whether their business affairs allowed them to be present or absent to us.)" Latin text in R. B. C. Huygens, "Guillaume de Tyr étudiant. Un chapitre (XIX,12) de son 'Histoire' retrouvé," *Latomus* 21 (1962): 822.

⁵⁹ Contained in MS Cambrai, Bibl. Mun. 259, thirteenth century, which also includes texts by St. Anselm, Yvo of Chartres, Rupert of Deutz, Honorius Augustodunensis, Hildebert of le Mans, Hugh and Richard of St-Victor; with the *Dialogus* are two "letters" concerning Everard. J. Leclercq, "Textes sur Saint Bernard et Gilbert de la Porree," *Mediaeval Studies* 14 (1952), with partial edition of *Dialogus* and the two letters. Nikolaus M. Häring, "A Latin Dialogue on the Doctrine of Gilbert of Poitiers," *Mediaeval Studies* 15 (1953) gives complete edition of *Dialogus*; "The Cistercian Everard of Ypres and His Appraisal of the Conflict between St. Bernard and Gilbert of Poitiers," *Mediaeval Studies* 17 (1955) adds edition of the letters. Häring does not make use of Leclercq's contribution.

evidence is to be believed, the dialogue was composed during the pontificate of Celestine III (1191–1198), in whose service Everard, one of the two protagonists in the dialogue, claims to have been while they were both in France some thirty years earlier.⁶⁰ Amusing digressions notwithstanding, the *Dialogus* is primarily a serious and capable defense of Gilbert of Poitiers' doctrines of the Trinity, which had come under attack at the Council of Reims in 1148; at the same time, the author maintains a respectful attitude toward St. Bernard. Overall, the *Dialogus* is rather an extraordinary work, whose author struggles to reconcile a profound conflict in which opposing but equally legitimate spiritual aspirations—those of the scholar and those of the monk, those of Martha and of Mary, those of Paris and of the cloister—receive sympathetic treatment.⁶¹

But our concern with the *Dialogus* is more concrete; we need to know if it proves that Gilbert taught in Chartres. That the Everard of the *Dialogus* is a historical personage was assumed tentatively by Leclercq, who brought the work to light, and taken for granted by Häring, who edited it. Häring identified the author/protagonist as Everard of Ypres, a scholar and canonist, author of a *Summula decretalium quaestionum*, who had studied liberal arts and possibly law in Paris and who ended his career as a Cistercian at Clairvaux in the late twelfth century.⁶² One might admit that it is just possible that “Everard” is the name of the genuine author of the work as well as of one of its *dramatis personae*; possible that this Everard hailed from Ypres, though all we know from the *Dialogus* is that he was not particularly fond of France; possible even that a second-string canonist might be able to give a lucid and technically correct defense of some of Gilbert's more difficult theological and philosophical doctrines, and would be inspired to do so in a highly imaginative, histrionic fashion. For the record, I am not comfortable accepting the identity which Häring has ferreted out for the author of this lively and unusual work.

Be that as it may, the real damage arises not from the alleged

⁶⁰ “Cum dicerem me fuisse clericum in Francia domini Hyacinthi, nunc papae”: Häring, “A Latin Dialogue,” 248.

⁶¹ See Leclercq, “Textes sur St. Bernard,” 114.

⁶² Häring, “The Cistercian Everard of Ypres,” 143–144; See also Stephan Kuttner, *Repertorium der Kanonistik I* (Vatican City, 1937), 187–188 for the *Summula*, which exists in MS Reims Bibl. Mun. 689, fols. 1–74. In this manuscript the author is given as “Everardus natione Ypresensis, professione monachus Clarevallensis, sed liberalium studio artium et disciplina scholarum facultatum Parisiensis.” Kuttner thinks the final phrase indicates that Everard studied law in Paris.

identity of the dialogue's fictional Everard with the factual Everard of Ypres, but from the attempts to draw biographical data from the second respondent in the *Dialogus*. This is a colorful character named Ratius, described in the *Dialogus* as a scholar from Athens, who, pausing in his travels at Everard's (unnamed) monastery, finds congenial conversation with that aged monk and erstwhile Parisian scholar. Ratius explains to Everard that he had been sent to study in France by his mother, Ratio Atheniensis, on the advice of his sister Sophia: the names are transparent, and we are without a doubt in the presence of a literary fiction. In the course of a long and frequently interrupted conversation, Ratius plays the role of the humanist and intellectual, the secular and speculative scholar, while Everard, though sympathetic (as a former scholar himself) defends his chosen contemplative life and the wisdom of the cloister in a lively and altogether convincing manner. If the two characters are symbols, the two conceptions of Christian wisdom are quite real, as Leclercq points out.

At one point during their wide-ranging discussion, Ratius gives a brief account of his academic career. Everard has just offered him the occasion to do so by remarking that he understood Ratius to be a former student of Gilbert of Poitiers. Ratius replies with a panegyric to Gilbert, and adds that his own mother, Athenian Reason, had sent him to study not just in France (a charmingly concrete example of the *translatio studii*) but specifically recommended him to Gilbert. Ratius then provides us with some remarkable particulars: that he was among four students in Chartres and nearly three hundred in Paris, "in the bishop's hall",⁶³ to attend Gilbert's lectures; that having learned Latin from Gilbert, he taught him Greek in return; and that he followed Gilbert from Paris to his episcopal appointment in Poitiers, remaining with the bishop until his death. Ratius ends this "autobiographical" digression by offering Gilbert the ultimate compliment, insisting that had Gilbert shone forth in Greece rather than in "garrulous France" his name would have been more celebrated than "our Plato".⁶⁴

⁶³ See below note 70 for this *aula episcopi*.

⁶⁴ Everard: "Audivi quia auditor ipsius [Gilbert] fuisti."

Ratius: "Fui equidem, unde et gaudio et semper gaudebo, ad quem audiendum mater mea, cuius nomen Ratio Atheniensis, consilio Sophie, mee sororis, me in Franciam misit; cui Carnoti quartus in lectione, Parisius in aula episcopi fere tercentesimus assedi, et ipsi episcopo Pictavis adhesi usque ad ipsius obitum; qui me docente grecam novam linguam, ego quoque ipso latinam . . . Qui si sic in Grecia sicut in garrula enituit Francia, nomen celebrius etiam nostro Platone iure

In order to squeeze as many facts from this dialogue as possible, Father Häring made a radical assumption: "When Ratius boasts of having followed Gilbert of Poitiers from Chartres to Paris and from Paris to Poitiers, he is probably impersonating Everard [of Ypres]".⁶⁵ Once this facile identification has been established, the "probably" drops quietly and permanently out of the equation, and the assertions come thick and fast: Everard of Ypres, the canonist, taught Gilbert Greek; Everard of Ypres "states explicitly that he studied in Chartres under Gilbert in a class of four, in Paris in a class of almost three hundred . . . he stayed with Gilbert in Poitiers until the bishop's death."⁶⁶

But "Everard" has stated nothing of the sort. The author of the dialogue, whoever he was, has invented a persona (Everard, the Cistercian, "*doctor quondam egregius*"⁶⁷ and a protagonist (Greek Reason itself, champion of speculative theologians), and has endowed the latter with a curriculum vitae suitable to his role as self-appointed defender of Gilbert's doctrine, which is the main burden of the dialogue. The author is clearly sympathetic to both cloister and classroom; it is just conceivable, given his age (he writes in the last decade of the twelfth century) that he might have been a student of Gilbert, fifty-odd years earlier. But this is no justification for taking literally a literary fiction. As tempting as it is, we dare not make the Ratius = Everard of Ypres leap of faith, and we leave Everard off the list (still blank) of Gilbert's known students in Chartres. Still, all is not completely lost. We would certainly be justified in accepting Ratius' anecdote as an indication that Gilbert was commonly agreed to have taught in Chartres.

All in all, the paucity of direct traces of Gilbert's academic presence in Chartres is surprising. As a final blow, the library at Chartres, in spite of benefitting from Gilbert's ministrations, apparently did not even contain a single copy of any work by Gilbert.⁶⁸

obtinuisset . . ." from the partial edition given by Leclercq, "Textes sur St. Bernard et Gilbert," 118.

⁶⁵ Häring, "The Cistercian Everard of Ypres," 146.

⁶⁶ Häring, "Chartres and Paris Revisited," 304. Southern and Dronke are among those who take these assertions as gospel.

⁶⁷ As he is addressed in one of the two "letters" which accompany the dialogue in the Cambrai manuscript; these letters are of a piece with the *Dialogus*, referring to it and to characters in it. See Leclercq, "Textes sur St. Bernard," 114.

⁶⁸ The only mention of any manuscript of Gilbert in Chartres is this reference in a catalogue compiled in 1826: "Auctoritates in sermones s. Bernardi super Canticum.

Quite on the contrary, there is an embarrassment of riches when it comes to Gilbert's teaching activity in Paris (including, possibly, Mont Sainte-Geneviève). To look again at the *Dialogus* and the remembrances of the fictional Ratius, it seems as if tradition were ready to accord classes of "nearly three hundred" students to Gilbert's credit in Paris, as opposed to the three colleagues of Ratius in Chartres; the contrast which the author of the dialogue feels obliged to make is striking.⁶⁹ The author of the *Dialogus* makes Ratius specify that Gilbert taught in "the bishop's hall", probably a reference to the lecture hall promised in an agreement between the canons of Notre-Dame and bishop Stephen of Senlis, in 1127.⁷⁰ In response to complaints from the canons that the growing numbers of "*scolares externi*" were causing disorder in the cloister (the enclosed area to the north and east of the former church of Notre-Dame, where the houses of the canons were situated), the bishop ordered the students expelled from the cloister precinct ("*Neque in illa parte claustrum que vulgo Tresantie nominantur deinceps legerent neque scola haberetur*"). In return he promised to build a sort of open hall on the other side of the church, but still within the claustral walls near the bishop's palace, where classes could then be held ("*in quo scola deinceps tenerentur et regerentur*"). This open hall, like the medieval Islamic *madrasas*, would have been able to accommodate several smaller groups of students and masters, or a throng of three hundred.

To continue in the murky realm of fiction, the *Metamorphosis Goliae* also places Gilbert securely among the constellation of masters shin-

Gilberti Porretani opusc., commentum Hugonis super Hierarchiam." G. F. Haenel, *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum qui in bibliothecis Galliae . . . asservantur* (Leipzig, 1830), col. 138; the manuscript is not in Stegmüller's *Repertorium* nor in the *Catalogue Général des Bibliothèques publiques de France* vol. 11, Chartres. The "opuscula" are probably Gilbert's commentaries on Boethius, which are much shorter than his biblical commentaries. For Gilbert's care of the *amarium* of Chartres cathedral chapter, see above n. 39. See also R. Giaccone, "Masters, Books and Library at Chartres According to the Cartularies of Notre-Dame and St-Père," *Vivarium* 12 (1974): 30–51.

⁶⁹ Plugging for Chartres, Peter Dronke endeavors to make capital out of these figures, which he accepts as autobiographical data from the life of Everard of Ypres: "clearly an open lecture course in Paris, more probably a 'seminar for advanced students' in Chartres"; "New Approaches to the School of Chartres," 121.

⁷⁰ B. Guérard, ed. *Cartulaire de l'Église Notre-Dame de Paris. Collection des documents inédits sur l'histoire de France*. vol. 1, 338–339. Suger of Saint-Denis and Gilduin, abbot of Saint-Victor were among those who witnessed this agreement. A. L. Gabriel, "Les Écoles de la Cathédrale de Notre-Dame et le commencement de l'Université de Paris," *Huitième Centenaire de Notre-Dame de Paris*, (1967), 145–146. See also Southern, "The Schools of Paris," 120 n. 17. The site was later occupied by the Collège des Dix-Huit; P. Riché, "Jean de Salisbury et le Monde Scolaire," 42.

ing forth (or recently extinguished) in Paris. In 1142/43 when the poem was written, Gilbert and Thierry of Chartres had just left Paris due to promotions; Abelard, too, had just departed, albeit under unhappier circumstances. They left behind them Robert of Melun, Peter Helias, Adam of the Petit Pont, Ivo, Peter Lombard, and others.⁷¹

The anonymous compiler of a catalogue of authors also does not hesitate to associate Gilbert with Paris. In this so-called "Appendix", compiled in the last third of the twelfth century, we read of "Gilbert, surnamed Porrata, first a *scolasticus* in Paris, then bishop of Poitiers" with never a mention of Chartres. The compiler elsewhere shows himself well-informed about Gilbert's career.⁷²

An advanced set of glosses on Priscian's *Institutes*, originating in a Parisian milieu in the last quarter of the twelfth century, gives us a lively portrait of Gilbert in full control of an unruly class, and provides another link to Paris.⁷³ The gloss *Promisimus* is full of local, left bank color, even mentioning (and correctly identifying) the Roman baths which now form part of the Musée Cluny. The compiler of the gloss, while discussing the correct placement of adjectives, cannot resist telling an anecdote about Gilbert, in which the master's grammar class has just been invaded by a "magister Garnerus Gramaticus" and some friends.⁷⁴ When Garnerus challenges "Magister Gillebertus Porretus" on some point, Gilbert catches him *in flagrante delicto* of the rules governing adjectives, since the adjective ("Porretus") ought to come first; "he then gave [Garnerius] a good thrashing", the compiler gleefully concludes.⁷⁵

⁷¹ See John F. Benton, "Philology's Search for Abelard in the *Metamorphosis Goliae*", *Speculum* 50 (1975); also, R. L. Poole, "Masters of the Schools of Paris and Chartres," 240ff.

⁷² Häring, "Two Catalogues of Medieval Authors," *Fransiscan Studies* 26 (1966): 207, 210: "Gillebertus cognomento Porrata primum scolasticus Parisiensis post Pictavensis episcopus . . ." The "Appendix" is found in MS Paris Bibl. Nat. lat. nouv. acq. 314, fols. 80v–82. In the same manuscript is a list of "viri illustres" which includes, on fol. 76, "Gilebertus cognomento porrata ex magistro theologie scole parisiis, pictavensis episcopus . . ." See also Hauréau, *Notices et extraits de quelques manuscrits latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 6 (1893), 162–173.

⁷³ See R. W. Hunt, "Studies on Priscian in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," Part 2, *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* (1950): 16–18, 41–42.

⁷⁴ This "master Garnerus" is apparently not a boy but an actual (if youthful) *magister*; his opinion is twice referred to elsewhere in the gloss.

⁷⁵ The anecdote is: "Alibi dicit Priscianus adiectiva debere fixis preponi . . . Inde contingit quod cum Magister Gar[nerus] G[ramati]cus et Magister Albricus et multi alii intrassent scholas Magistri Gil[leberti] Porrete, et Magister Gar[nerus] dixisset ad Magistrum: 'Magister Gilleberte Por[rete], responde', indigne tulit dominus. 'Garcio,

The *locus classicus* for proof of Gilbert's teaching career in Paris is of course John of Salisbury's confusing account of his student years in the *Metalogicon*, which has been reviewed above for what it tells us of Gilbert's sojourn in Chartres. We have seen that John heard Gilbert lecture on logic and theology somewhere in or near Paris in 1141, and that he knew Gilbert, or even studied with him earlier, possibly also in Paris.

From Stephen Langton we have the information that Gilbert taught, evidently in Paris, using the *Glossa ordinaria* as a teaching text.⁷⁶ In his own commentary on 2 Chronicles 4:4 ("and the sea itself was set upon the twelve oxen") Langton refers his readers to the *Glossa's* exhaustive entry for the types of the number twelve in Acts 1:13 (concerning the twelve Apostles). Stephen then reports that Gilbert, questioned by students on the types of twelve, had neglected to mention the *XII boves* in his treatment of the same passage. It would be surprising for Langton to be so informed on Gilbert's oral teaching on the Acts of the Apostles, unless there were still current in the Parisian schools, where Langton was teaching in the 1180's, a vivid recollection of Gilbert's lectures on *sacra pagina* a generation earlier.⁷⁷

As yet another tantalizing clue to Gilbert's extended professional presence in Paris, there existed a "rue des Poirées" which began at the street of St. Jacques and ran west past the rue de la Harpe, at which intersection the College de Cluny was situated in the next century.⁷⁸ The street's original name was *vicus porretarum* or *vicus ad porretas*, and apparently had something to do with leeks. Its location, steps away from the Roman *termae* mentioned in the gloss *Promisimus*,

nescias quod adiectiva debent fixis preponi? Quia male dixisti, lues.' Fecitque eum optime verberari." This anecdote is full of interest. It confirms the rough-and-tumble atmosphere evoked, for instance, in Abelard's *Historia Calamitatum*. It is also another example of Gilbert's fondness for referring to his adversaries as mercenary (see note 54 above); the word *garcio* connoted mercenary or servant; it is not used as "boy" until a century later (Niermayer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*). This story is certainly not evidence that Gilbert wanted to be known as "Porretus Gillebertus", as Häring, missing Gilbert's sarcasm, suggests; "Epitaphs," 78.

⁷⁶ Gilbert's role in promoting the *Glossa* to its almost universal recognition as the standard school text will be addressed in Chapter 5. See also Smalley, *Study of the Bible*, 64.

⁷⁷ In Langton's comments on II Paralipomenon (Chronicles): MS Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 14414; cited in B. Smalley, "La Glossa Ordinaria," *RTAM* 9 (1937): 370. See also chap. 5, n. 22; and van Elswick, *Gilbert Porreta*, 27.

⁷⁸ A. Franklin, *Les Anciens Plans de Paris. Notices historiques et topographiques* (Paris, 1878), vol. 1:95, 106. It was known as *rue Gerson* after 1864, but no longer exists.

minutes from Mont Sainte-Geneviève and from the Petit Pont, and right across the river from the "bishop's hall", adds to the likelihood that it was used for student lodgings and for classrooms. It has been proposed that Gilbert and his students acquired the appellations "Porreta" or "Porretani" in consequence of their long association with or residency in that street (much as Adam and his students were called "Parvipontani"),⁷⁹ suggesting rather more than the single year that Gilbert is conventionally allowed in Paris.

To sum up, Gilbert is reputed to have taught three hundred students in the "bishop's hall", and (just possibly) taught also on Mont Sainte-Geneviève and in the *rue des Poirées*; to be among the constellation of great masters in Paris lamented by the author of the *Metamorphosis Goliae*; to have been widely known as a *scolasticus* of Paris; to have taught grammar, logic, and *sacra pagina*. This is a great deal of activity to collapse into the very brief time—part of the year 1141 and possibly part of 1142—which modern scholarship allots to Gilbert's Parisian career. This accords well with the paucity of evidence for his teaching career in Chartres; though the author of the *Dialogus* reports that Gilbert had a few students in Chartres, and John of Salisbury probably met him there and possibly even studied with him there, it really looks as if Gilbert's contemporaries associated him above all with the schools of Paris.

We have attempted to localize Gilbert a little more clearly within the great Laon—Chartres—Paris triangle, in order to suggest the milieu in which Gilbert studied and taught, and for which he composed his commentary on the Psalms. To conjure up the noble ghosts of these three centers of learning is to summarize the academic influences which shaped him. But neither Chartres nor Laon was tradition-bound, much less Paris; the proliferation of students and teachers, the competition between masters and methods, the resurrection of neglected texts and the composition of new ones made the early years of the twelfth century rich with experiments and initiatives. In particular, the need to adapt the study of the Bible to this new environment resulted in various attempts to "professionalize" theology. From Laon to Paris, masters of Gilbert's temperament turned

⁷⁹ See F. Pelster, "Gilbert de la Porrée, Gilbertus Porretanus, oder Gilbertus Porreta?" in *Scholastik* 24 (1949): 401–403; Häring, "Chartres and Paris Revisited," 103 n. 35. See also A. Berty and L. M. Tisserand, *Histoire générale de Paris. Topographie hist. du vieux Paris* (Paris, 1897), 372–373.

all their resources to make of theology an academic discipline as “scientific” as anything in the trivium or quadrivium, and immeasurably more profound. We shall see how Gilbert responded to the challenge of teaching Scripture in the fast-changing scholastic arena of his day.

CHAPTER TWO

MANUSCRIPTS AND *MISE EN PAGE*

The manuscripts of Gilbert's Psalms commentary are particularly interesting because the visual presentation of the contents plays such a vital role in them. Beryl Smalley regretted that the "practical needs and purpose" of the glossators were "too remote for our judgment";¹ but in fact the practical needs and purposes of Gilbert and his students are thrown into high relief by the way Gilbert chooses to present his material, as much as by what material he chooses to present. The actual process of arranging and transmitting information is a clue to the development of any discipline;² in this regard, Gilbert's generation's experimentation with glossed texts and sentence collections is of critical importance. The evolution of biblical exegesis into theology in the course of the twelfth century is illuminated by Gilbert's approach to his material, what we may call his "information management". With this in mind we will examine how Gilbert's program expresses itself through certain peculiarities of his *mise en page*.

The unusual physical appearance of Gilbert's commentary has naturally not gone unnoticed by modern scholars, but in general the peculiarities have been dismissed or misunderstood. In few instances have there been any attempts to uncover the inspiration or the motivation for individual elements of Gilbert's scheme; in no case have the principles guiding Gilbert's experiments, or the way in which each element of the format works with the others, been adequately explored. This is a serious oversight, since Gilbert went to great effort to exploit the latest in pedagogical method to make his commentary as "user friendly" as possible.

Obviously, this approach assumes that the format preserved in the manuscripts is in fact mandated or at least approved by Gilbert and that it accurately reflects, in some way, his pedagogical methods. Since

¹ Smalley, *Study of the Bible*, 66.

² "C'est déjà pénétrer dans un esprit que de voir comment il s'exprime, et par quels procédés il transmet pensées et doctrines." G. Paré, A. Brunet and P. Tremblay, *La Renaissance du XII^e Siècle: Les écoles et l'enseignement* (Paris, 1933), 109. The physical format is not, however, a concern of Messrs Paré, Brunet and Tremblay.

this assumption has been questioned on several grounds, we first will have to defend its viability. Gilbert's involvement in the design of the page layout has been denied³ partly due to a tautological argument concerning the late "invention" of certain elements of the layout, and partly due to a lack of appreciation of two intimate liaisons: between the format and the content of Gilbert's commentary, and between the teaching of the liberal arts and the teaching of theology in Gilbert's day. In this chapter we will attempt to explain why Gilbert's commentary appears in the form that it does, and why this is significant for understanding Gilbert's exegetical and pedagogical program.

In order to locate Gilbert's innovations more securely in the chronology of twelfth-century theological developments, however, we must first try to determine when the commentary was actually composed and released for circulation. The date of the commentary, variously given as "before 1117" and "ca. 1135",⁴ depends on three factors: the dating of the manuscripts, the evidence of the colophon in one of the manuscripts, and the relationship between Gilbert's commentary and other glosses, including the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms. The first two factors will be examined in this chapter; the third, though it will of necessity be touched on here, will be investigated more thoroughly in chapters 4 and 5.

Before we begin to address these issues, a preliminary description of the characteristically "gilbertine" format is in order, since we will be alluding to it frequently. In brief, the gilbertine format consists of two main components. The first is the inclusion of a set of marginal symbols, indicating thematic content of certain psalms, which we will call the cross-index. The second element is a page layout in which the commented text (in this case, the Book of Psalms) runs in a column parallel to the commentary, which we will call the two-column or *cum textu* format. The cross-index system is unique to Gilbert's Psalms commentary; there is nothing remotely like it in the Middle Ages until Grosseteste's biblical and patristic concordances a century later.⁵

³ Christopher De Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Book Trade* (Dover, New Hampshire, 1984), esp. 14–27.

⁴ See page 29 below.

⁵ See Richard W. Southern, *Robert Grosseteste. The growth of an English mind in Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 1986), esp. 186–193; S. Harrison Thomson, "Grosseteste's Topical Concordance of the Bible and the Fathers," *Speculum* 9 (1934): 139–44; "Grosseteste's Concordantial Signs," *Medievalia et humanistica* 9 (1955): 39–53; R. W. Hunt, "Manuscripts containing the indexing symbols of Robert Grosseteste," *Bodleian Library Record* 4, no. 5 (1953): 241–255. None of these mention Gilbert of Poitiers.

The *cum textu* layout, on the contrary, appears in most manuscripts of all of Gilbert's commentaries, namely, those on the Pauline Epistles and on the *Opuscula sacra* of Boethius as well as on the Psalms. It has been claimed that this layout is also unique to Gilbert's commentaries,⁶ but we shall see that this is not the case, though Gilbert's use of it is unusual and significant.

In addition to these two major characteristics of format, there are two minor idiosyncracies: most manuscripts of Gilbert's Psalms commentary are liberally sprinkled with marginal references indicating patristic and Carolingian sources for the commentary; and the psalms (or the commentary, if the psalm text is not present) are almost invariably numbered. These scholarly devices, while not unknown before Gilbert's time, receive a new status through Gilbert's use of them, and will be investigated as appropriate.

The date of the commentary

The extraordinary popularity enjoyed by Gilbert's commentary on the Psalms is reflected in the large number of manuscripts extant: to the best of current knowledge, there exist fifty-one manuscripts dating from the twelfth century alone, as well as others, indicated in medieval library catalogues, which seem to have disappeared.⁷ Further research is likely to uncover still more copies currently masquerading as works of Augustine, Remigius, Gilbert the Cistercian, and others.⁸ Gilbert's contemporaries considered the work to be a marvel,⁹ and it was enthusiastically recommended among works of *theologia*.

⁶ De Hamel, *Glossed Books*, 22–23, 59.

⁷ For an interesting comparison to the (relatively low) numbers of manuscripts for other major authors of the twelfth century, see Nikolaus M. Häring, "Abelard Yesterday and Today," in *Pierre Abélard—Pierre le Vénérable*, 343–344; Giles Constable, "The Popularity of Twelfth-Century Spiritual Writers in the Middle Ages," in *Renaissance: Studies in Honor of Hans Baron* ed. A. Molho and J. A. Tedeschi (Dekalb, IL, 1971), 5–28.

⁸ See Nikolaus M. Häring, "Handschriftliches zu den Werken Gilberts Bischof von Poitiers," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 8 (1978): 133–194. See also Appendix II.

⁹ Anonymous twelfth-century epitaph, "De commendatione magistri Gisleberti": "... super psalmos et epistolas Pauli eius opera mirabili labore mirabiliter composita", ed., tr. Nikolaus M. Häring, "Epitaphs and Necrologies on Bishop Gilbert II of Poitiers," *AHDLM* 36 (1969): 76, 79. Also, Robert of Torigny, abbot of Mont St-Michel, approved of Gilbert's commentaries as "brilliant": "vir religiosus et multiplicis doctrine qui psalmos et epistolas Pauli luculenter exposuit." *Chronica*, MGH SS 6:504.

Peter of Celles, abbot of Saint-Remi (1162–1180), advised a monk of Saint-Bertin: “If you prefer new works, here are writings by master Hugo, saint Bernard, master Gilbert and master Peter, in which neither roses nor lilies lack.”¹⁰ Gilbert is presented in fine company. Both secular and monastic scholars were quick to secure copies; Gerhoch of Reichersberg already had Gilbert’s Epistles commentary in hand by 1141, and in 1154 he remarked that he had read Gilbert on the Psalms “*longis retro temporibus*”. His own commentary on the Psalms, composed between 1144–1148, relied very heavily upon Gilbert’s earlier work despite Gerhoch’s distrust of the products of the Laon school in general.¹¹ There were copies to be found in Benedictine libraries, Premonstratensian libraries, Augustinian libraries, Cistercian and Carthusian libraries; cathedral schools too were well supplied.¹²

Though by far the greatest concentration of manuscripts was (and remains) in northeastern France, Gilbert’s commentary quickly travelled the length and breadth of Europe. By mid-twelfth century copies could be found as far north as Durham Cathedral, and as far east as Vorau Abbey in southeastern Austria shortly thereafter; there is a twelfth-century exemplar of Italian origin now in Klosterneuburg, and a manuscript in Clairvaux was apparently made either in Spain or by a Spanish-trained copyist in the first or second quarter of the twelfth century.¹³

¹⁰ “Si nova placent, ecce magistri Hugonis, ecce sancti Bernardi, ecce magistri Gilleberti et magistri Petri scripta, in quibus nec rosae nec lilia desunt”: *Epistolae*, letter 167, *PL* 202:610. Abbot Peter is responding to the monk’s request for copies of Peter’s own *sermones*, so it is sometimes assumed that what he then recommends are the sermons of Hugo, St. Bernard, Gilbert and Peter Lombard. This has provoked a fruitless search for Gilbert’s “sermons”. However, Van Elswijk points out that Peter never claims that there were sermons of Gilbert in circulation, rather that in addition to the *sermones* of the Fathers, there are excellent “writings” (*scripta*) available by these contemporary authors. Van Elswijk observes (*Gilbert Porreta*, 51) that the exegetical works of Gilbert are, “in certain regards”, similar to sermon collections; on this see p. 64 below. Gottschalk, abbot of St-Bertin (1163–1173) did commission copies of both Gilbert’s and Peter Lombard’s commentaries on the Epistles of Paul (*Gesta abbatum*, *MGH SS* 13:669), the former of which survives as MS Boulogne-sur-Mer Bibliothèque Municipale 24. We have no indication of Gilbert’s Psalms commentary at St-Bertin, but the library at St-Remi did boast a copy: it was MS 130 in the library of Reims before it disappeared (J. Lelong, *Bibliotheca sacra*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1723), 911. See Häring, “Handschriftliches,” 145, 153.

¹¹ Damian Van den Eynde, *L’oeuvre littéraire de Géroch de Reichersberg* (Rome, 1957), 227, 299–300, 358–396.

¹² The dates at which these libraries acquired their manuscripts of Gilbert’s Psalm commentary is not always clear, but there is evidence of heavy traffic in this work in the twelfth century. Please see Appendix II for details.

¹³ MS Durham A.111.10: among the books of prior Lawrence (1149–1158) left to

Also attesting to the astonishing authority which Gilbert's Psalms commentary enjoyed is the fact that its Prologue rapidly attained an existence independent from the rest of the commentary. Just after mid-century, Gilbert's Prologue began to be appropriated to introduce other commentaries on the Psalms, both those related to and those entirely unrelated to Gilbert's own. So far, nine different Psalms commentaries have been found graced with Gilbert's Prologue (including an early manuscript of Peter Lombard's Psalms commentary) suggesting that it quickly achieved authoritative status.¹⁴

There is no question therefore that Gilbert's commentary was widely available and highly regarded already by the second half of the century, but the actual date of composition has been in dispute. The commentary is sometimes presented as having been compiled during Gilbert's sojourn in Laon, sometimes as a product of his years in Chartres, or even in Paris. Those who accept the earlier date include H. C. van Elswijk (but with the qualification that the commentary might have been re-worked later), L. O. Nielsen, and N. M. Häring, who claims that the pre-1117 date is "generally admitted".¹⁵ Among those who do not admit it, but who suppose the commentary rather to have been produced in Chartres, is D. Van den Eynde, who says it is "well known" that the commentary dates to 1125–1130.¹⁶ Beryl Smalley only ventured that Gilbert's commentary was

the cathedral library was a two volume set of Gilbert's Psalms commentary, of which this manuscript appears to be the second half; C. H. Turner, "The Earliest List of Durham Manuscripts," *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1907–8): 121–132. Vorau 261: the twelfth-century *ex libris* states "Hic est liber S. Marie sanctique Thome apostoli vorovensium canonicorum. Quem Otakarius archidiaconis marcioni Otachario et ille nostre ecclesie contulit . . ." This appears to be Ottakar von Fischau, who appears in documents from December 1161; his successor is in office two years later; Peter Classen, "Zur Geschichte der Früh-scholastik in Österreich und Bayern," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 67 (1959): 261; Pius Fank, *Catalogus Voraviensis* (Graz, 1936), 146. Klosterneuburg 815: this manuscript is estimated to be late twelfth century, of Italian origin: Häring, "Handschriftliches," 161. Troyes 815 shows a strong Iberian influence, according to L. Morel-Payen, *Les plus beaux manuscrits de la bibliothèque de Troyes* (Troyes, 1935), 17, 85–6, pl. X, fig. 33; for date, Leroquais, *Psautiers* 2: 236.

¹⁴ See Appendix II. The earliest datable is MS Oxford Bodleian Auct D.4.6., before 1164, while the latest is Reg. Hisp. 2C1, dated 1244. It is likely that more such cases will turn up with further search.

¹⁵ Van Elswijk, *Gilbert Porreta*, 46; Lauge Olaf Nielsen, *Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century* (Leiden, 1982), 40; Häring, "Handschriftliches," 136.

¹⁶ Damian Van den Eynde, "Literary Note on the Earliest Scholastic *Commentarii in Psalmos*," *Franciscan Studies* 14 (1954): 123; also Leroquais *Psautiers*, 40; de Hamel *Glossed Books*, 4; and Wilfried Hartmann, "Psalmenkommentare aus der Zeit der Reform und der Frühscholastik," *Studi Gregoriani* 9 (1972): 313–366.

written after Anselm's *parva* gloss on the Psalms and before Peter Lombard's commentary.¹⁷

Indeed, the principle reason behind the desire to see a later date for the commentary seems to be that, having decided that Gilbert's commentary was little more than a concatenation of the *Glossa ordinaria*,¹⁸ modern scholarship wanted more time between the appearance of the *Glossa* and Gilbert's "expansion" of it. Anselm's alleged authorship of the *Glossa* on the Psalms notwithstanding, it does not appear to have made its debut before *circa* 1140 in Paris or elsewhere.¹⁹ Indeed, Beryl Smalley once hazarded the opinion that Gilbert himself was instrumental in introducing the *Glossa ordinaria* to Parisian scholars.²⁰

Aside from this objection, there is only negative evidence to support the later date of Gilbert's commentary: that is to say, there are no dated manuscripts of the commentary before the 1140s. The lag between the presumed writing of the text and the first appearance of an extant manuscript does not seem to disturb those who accept Anselm's authorship of the *Glossa ordinaria* but the same lag seems to convince some scholars of a relatively late date for Gilbert's composition. The earliest manuscript of Gilbert's Psalms commentary datable from external evidence is number 488 in the municipal library of Troyes. It is one of a set of glossed books of the bible (a *bibliotheca*) made for Henry, a son of Louis VI, who resided at Clairvaux between 1146–1149 prior to his promotion to the episcopacy of Beauvais (and ultimately to the archiepiscopacy of Reims).²¹ Henry left his

¹⁷ Smalley, *Study*, 64.

¹⁸ In the only article dedicated to an analysis of Gilbert's commentary on the Psalms, H. C. Van Elswijk opines that it is "not much more than an elaboration of the *Glossa ordinaria* of Anselm of Laon"; "Gilbert Porreta als glossator van het Psalterium," *Jubileumbundel voor G.P. Kreling* (Nijmegen, 1953), 292. Only Beryl Smalley has suggested that it might be more complex; *Study* (Preface to the 3rd ed.), vii.

¹⁹ It is generally conceded that Anselm (ob. 1117) was at least the primary author of the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles. Nonetheless, actual manuscripts of the *Glossa* on the Psalms do not seem to exist before the 1140s. Those indicated in library catalogues as "late eleventh century" and the like invariably turn out to be, not the *Glossa*, but some *glose përimée*, as Beryl Smalley calls the multitudinous glosses which never found widespread popularity. See Smalley, *Study*, 64; "Les commentaires bibliques de l'époque romane: glose ordinaire et gloses përimées," *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 4 (1961): 15–22; "Gilbertus Universalis and the problem of the '*Glossa ordinaria*,'" *RTAM* 8 (1936): 30–31, 44. P. Stirnemann, "Où ont été fabriqués les livres de la glose ordinaire," 257–264. See chap. 4 below.

²⁰ B. Smalley, "La *Glossa Ordinaria*, quelques prédécesseurs d'Anselme de Laon," *RTAM* 9 (1937): 367.

²¹ With the exception of Gilbert's commentary, these are all marginal/interlinear

bibliotheca to the library of Clairvaux. Several of these manuscripts bear an *ex libris* of "*Henricus regis filius*" to which is added in another hand "*dedit*". It was once held that this means of identifying the prince argued for a date prior to the death of Louis VI in 1137, but this theory has been strongly contested; nevertheless, a date in the very early 1140s is sustainable.²² Other manuscripts which are datable from external evidence yield similar dates: Valenciennes 44, from Saint-Amand, was acquired for the monastery in the time of Abbot Hugh (1150–1168);²³ a library list of the holdings of Durham Cathedral library, datable to 1149–1158, attests to the existence of Gilbert's commentary, in two volumes, the second volume of which is now MS A.111.10 (the first volume has disappeared).²⁴

The datable manuscripts, therefore, yield little earlier than the 1140s. This, in addition to the fact that both Gerhoch of Reichersberg and Peter Lombard had access to Gilbert's commentary at this time,²⁵ would seem to reinforce the impression that, whenever the commentary was actually written, it was not in circulation much before Gilbert's promotion to the see of Poitiers in 1141.

However, other evidence points to the commentary's existence at an earlier date. An intriguing colophon, appended to Gilbert's commentary in the manuscript Oxford Balliol 36, states that Gilbert read the commentary in the presence of his master so that Anselm could

glosses. Guy Lobrichon calls them "gloses laonnoises" but to what extent they are "*ordinaire*" is not clear; "Une nouveauté: les gloses de la Bible," in *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, ed. Pierre Riché and Guy Lobrichon (Paris, 1984), 108.

²² The *bibliotheca* also includes Troyes 2266, which is Gilbert's Epistles commentary. For the earlier date, see G. Lobrichon, "Une nouveauté: les gloses de la Bible," 108 n. 29. For arguments for the later date, de Hamel, *Glossed Books*, 6n, 18, and P. Stürnemann, "Où ont été fabriqué les livres de la glose ordinaire," 272–273. See also Smalley, "Gilbertus Universalis," 44; G. D. Hobson, "Further notes on romanesque bindings," *The Library* 15 (1935): 161–211; A. Wilmart, "L'ancienne bibliothèque de Clairvaux," *Mémoires de la Société académique de l'Aube* 54 (1917): 175–182, who first brought this *bibliotheca* to notice.

²³ In the twelfth century catalogue of the library of St-Amand, this appears to have been item 11, "[Psalterium] Gilliberti glossatum"; Leopold V. Delisle, *Le Cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1874), 449; see Häring, "Handschriftliches," 142.

²⁴ *Catalogue of the Library of Durham Cathedral*, (London, 1838) 3: "Gilebertus Porree super psalterium in duobus voluminibus"; cited in Häring, "Handschriftliches," 158. R. A. B. Mynors, *Durham Cathedral Manuscripts* (Oxford, 1939), 73–74, illust. pl. 45.

²⁵ Gerhoch's Psalms commentary dates to 1144–1148. Van den Eynde says that a date of 1134–1138 for Peter Lombard's Psalms commentary is "well-known"; "Literary Note," 123; though I. Brady points out that it was apparently not completed or made public until after 1155: "Prolegomena," *Magistri Petri Lombardi . . . Sententiae* (Quaracchi, 1971), 1:58.

review and approve it.²⁶ We are encouraged to imagine Gilbert lecturing on the Psalms at Laon, still under the supervision of the venerable Anselm but already lecturing on *sacra pagina*.²⁷ Since Anselm died in May of 1117, the colophon would seem to offer an unequivocal *terminus ad quem* for the composition of Gilbert's commentary.

The evidence of the colophon has been challenged on the grounds that it is anonymous and not repeated in any other manuscript, yet the early date and the provenance of the manuscript itself allows us to admit that the colophon might be an accurate, if not an eyewitness, report of the "recitation" described. In fact, the manuscript was owned by a close contemporary and colleague of Gilbert: Robert de Chesney, who quite possibly studied under Anselm and Ralph in Laon, was a master of theology, apparently in Paris, around the year 1141, and left the schools to accept an appointment to the see of Lincoln in 1148.²⁸ He bequeathed his books to the library of the cathedral chapter in Lincoln.²⁹ A further suggestive (though by no

²⁶ "Explicit glosatura magistri gilberti porretani super psalterium, quam ipse recitavit coram suo magistro anselmo, causa emendationis." Balliol 36, fol. 145v. The colophon has been variously miscopied as "terra Emerederonis", "las Emeredonensis", and identified as the gloss of "Peter" of Poitiers "in terra Lacerdonis" (H. O. Coxe, *Catalogue of the MSS in the Oxford Colleges* vol. 1 (Oxford, 1852), 10–11; A. M. Landgraf, "Die Abhängigkeit der Sünde von Gott nach der Lehre der Früh-scholastik," *Scholastik* 10 (1935): 181 n. 80; and Lesne, *Les écoles*, 305, respectively). R. W. Hunt finally gives the correct reading in "Introductions to the 'Artes' in the Twelfth Century," in *Studia mediaevalia in honorem . . . Raymundi Josephi Martin* (Bruges, 1948), 96n.

²⁷ Compare Anselm's expulsion of Abelard, around 1114, after that ambitious student's unauthorized attempt to expound Ezekiel for his fellows: *Historia calamitatum* (PL 178:125). This episode is often explained in terms of a *scholasticus* exercising his teaching monopoly; see Stephen Ferruolo, *The Origins of the University* (Stanford, 1985), 20. But there is more than territorial jealousy operating here; teachers knew full well the dangers of having the errors of their students imputed to themselves. Gilbert himself was to suffer this indignity at his trial for heresy in 1148; Nielsen, *Theology and Philosophy*, 34. On the correcting of students' *reportationes* for this reason, Smalley, *Study*, 201–202.

²⁸ Margaret Gibson, in personal communication (May, 1989), expressed her doubts as to the dependability of the colophon. She points out that the colophon is not written in the same hand as the rest of the text. However, it is similar and contemporary, and it is conceivably the hand of Robert himself, writing down his reminiscence as he donated his books to the chapter library.

²⁹ The manuscript in question ended up in Balliol "ex dono Willelmi Gray Eliensis episcopi" (ob. 1498), according to the *ex libris* on the title page. But it was given to the cathedral chapter of Lincoln by Robert (ob. 1166), as is commemorated in the twelfth-century library list written by the chapter's chancellor, Hamo: "De dono Roberti secundi. bone memorie episcopi. Psalterium, iuxta glosaturam Gilleberti. sine textu"; in R. Maxwell Woolley, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Lincoln Cathedral Library* (Oxford, 1927), vii. On the fly-leaf is an erased inscription, "Liber sce marie Linc". See R. A. B. Mynors, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Balliol College, Oxford* (Ox-

means conclusive) detail is the manner in which Gilbert is named in the colophon. Gilbert is described neither as “*episcopus*” nor as “*pictaviensis*” but simply as “*magister Gilibertus Porretanus*”, the name by which he was known while teaching in Paris.³⁰ My own opinion is that this colophon indeed represents an accurate recollection of events, and that Gilbert did publicly present his commentary “*coram suo magistro Anselmo*”, that is, in Anselm’s school at Laon and under his auspices.

Even scholars who accept the evidence of the colophon, however, are reluctant to admit such an early date for Gilbert’s commentary, suggesting rather that Gilbert continued to work on it after he left Laon.³¹ This scenario can profitably be compared with Herbert of Bosham’s description of Peter Lombard, who, having compiled a commentary on the Psalms for his own use, used it as a base for lectures in the schools of Paris, ultimately including further thought and material before releasing it for general consumption.³² Such a proposition makes little sense in Gilbert’s case. If indeed Gilbert had continued to revise his Psalms commentary into the 1130s, it would be remarkable that the work would so stubbornly refuse to reflect any of the methodological, pedagogical and philosophical developments which Gilbert’s later work evidences: notably absent in Gilbert’s Psalms commentary are the speculative *quaestiones* on doctrinal issues which appear in his commentary on the Epistles of Paul, as they do in other commentaries of the mid-1130s.³³ The Psalms commentary also lacks the “characteristic Porretan themes” and (fortunately) the

ford, 1963) 26. On Robert’s career, A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to 1500* (Oxford, 1937) 1:406.

³⁰ See F. Pelster, “Gilbert de la Porrée, Gilbertus Porretanus oder Gilbertus Porreta?” *Scholastik* 24 (1949): 401–403. The absence of the usual descriptive tags such as “*episcopus pictaviensis*” makes it look like this colophon was written before that honor was conferred upon Gilbert, or by someone thinking of Gilbert as he knew him “back when”.

³¹ For example, Van Elswijk, *Gilbert Porreta*, 46, who proposes Chartres; and Jean Châtillon, “La Bible dans les écoles du XII^e siècle,” in *Le Moyen Age et la Bible* (Paris, 1984), 191, who suggests Paris; neither scholar offers reasons.

³² From Herbert’s prologue to his own “edition” of the Lombard’s *magna glosatura*; cited and discussed in Brady, “Prolegomena,” 51–61. Brady makes it clear that manuscripts of the Lombard’s commentary do not support the hypothesis of multiple versions in circulation.

³³ Maurice Simon, “La glose de l’Épître aux Romains de Gilbert de la Porrée,” *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* 52 (1957): 62, 71–72. There is no doubt that Gilbert’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles was written and circulated by ca. 1135: see Van Elswijk, *Gilbert Porreta*, 57, and for the earliest extant datable manuscript, de Hamel, *Glossed Books*, 6. On the use of *quaestiones* in biblical glosses, see Smalley, *Study*, 72–73.

“highly complex syntactical structure” of Gilbert’s language, which mark his later compositions.³⁴ On the contrary, the “Carolingian” technique (as Fr. Häring rather condescendingly referred to it)³⁵ of the Psalms commentary ties it to an earlier generation of commentary tradition.

Furthermore, the absence of any significant variants in the manuscript tradition of the commentary does not encourage the speculation that the commentary had time to circulate in unauthorized earlier versions before Gilbert released it for publication. There are at least four “edited” versions of Gilbert’s commentary, but they are all demonstrably later than 1150.³⁶

Finally, though it is not securely datable by external evidence, one manuscript claims an origin in the first decades of the century through its script and decoration. Now in the municipal library of Troyes, codex 988 had been judged to be a product of the late eleventh century until Leroquais noticed that the manuscript itself could not predate the text it contained, namely Gilbert’s Psalms commentary. Leroquais prudently re-assigned the manuscript to the “first half” of the twelfth century.³⁷

This lengthy consideration of the date of Gilbert’s commentary has yielded the conclusion that it probably was completed in its essentials at Laon, prior to Anselm’s death in 1117, putting the commentary squarely in the thick of Scripture glossing activity at Laon. It does not appear, however, to have been “published” before the time period which we associate with Gilbert’s teaching in Chartres and especially in Paris. Specifically, it makes Gilbert’s commentary roughly simultaneous with Anselm’s *parva* gloss on the Psalms, and

³⁴ Nielsen, *Theology and Philosophy*, 40, 20.

³⁵ “Commentary and Hermeneutics,” in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Robert L. Benton and Giles Constable (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), 181.

³⁶ MSS Dijon 33; Oxford Bodleian Auct.D.2.1 and Auct.D.4.6; Valenciennes 42–43. It is important to emphasize that Gilbert released the commentary himself, and that there is no question that it was “derived from the master’s spoken lectures” as de Hamel opaquely suggests in the case of Peter Lombard (*Glossed Books*, 21). De Hamel’s concern here is for the formats in which Gilbert’s and Peter’s treatises were presented, and he wants to argue that a “dictated gloss . . . would naturally contain no inherent page layout.”

³⁷ Leroquais, *Psautiers*, 2:242, no. 447: “La glose est celle de Gilbert de la Porrée; notre manuscrit date donc tout au plus de la première moitié du XXI^e siècle, et non du XI^e–XII^e siècle comme l’indique le *Catalogue général* (série in-quarto, t. II, p. 411).” Unsure exactly when Gilbert wrote this commentary, Leroquais provides a safe margin of error. This interesting early manuscript is not in de Hamel’s study.

thus offers interesting new insights concerning the relationship between those two works. But because of the time lag between its conception and its appearance in public, it also will have something to say concerning the centers of glossed manuscript production in France. We will investigate that subject in chapter five.

The mise en page: cum textu and catena layouts

We now turn to a consideration of the formats of the manuscripts. The characteristic page layout of all Gilbert's exegetical output (for it appears in his Pauline and Boethian commentaries as well), the *cum textu* format has been the subject of speculation by Christopher de Hamel in his consideration of the development of the Parisian glossed books trade.³⁸ De Hamel's otherwise useful study takes a formalist approach to the glossed page, which does not take into account the content and the purpose of Gilbert's commentary, consequently minimizing Gilbert's achievement and introducing perplexing inconsistencies. A fresh investigation of the manuscripts is therefore in order.³⁹

It must be noted first of all that Gilbert's commentary on the Psalms is available in two formats.⁴⁰ One is a simple layout consisting of two columns per page, in which the commentary alone is presented like any other continuous text. In these manuscripts, the beginning of the commentary for each Psalm is marked by a large initial, usually colored; the initial is that of the first word of the Psalm being glossed. This type of traditional page layout has been labelled, in the case of Gilbert's commentary, a *catena* arrangement.⁴¹ This is somewhat misleading nomenclature, since a *catena* is accurately a "chain" of patristic and other authoritative opinions strung together, yet Gilbert's commentary is considerably more original than that, as we will see. In

³⁸ De Hamel, *Glossed Books*. See also the useful reviews of *Glossed Books* by Margaret Gibson in *The Library: The Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* 8 no. 2 (1986): 166–169, and by Patricia Stirnemann in *Bulletin Monumental* 143 (1985): 363–367.

³⁹ The discussion which follows is not intended to be a critique of Dr. de Hamel's book, which is a very useful work, but rather an analysis of the material from a new starting point. However, since de Hamel's is the only study which considers at length the format of Gilbert's commentary, it will necessarily be referred to frequently.

⁴⁰ As are his other two commentaries. In general, what is said here about the formats of the Psalms commentary is applicable to those commentaries as well.

⁴¹ De Hamel, *Glossed Books*, 19.

fact Gilbert rarely cites his patristic or Carolingian sources verbatim, but prefers to paraphrase them to suit his argument. Neither the manuscripts themselves nor Gilbert's contemporaries ever called his work a *catena*; *glosa*, *expositio*, *tractatus* and (less frequently) *commentum* and related words are preferred.⁴² His contemporaries described the work as "continuous" merely to contrast it with the marginal and interlinear glosses current in the schools.⁴³ We would do best to think of Gilbert's commentary not as a *catena*, but as an exposition of the Psalter organized in the order of the psalms themselves. This distinction will appear more noteworthy once we compare Gilbert's commentary to the *Glossa ordinaria*.

A closer look at this simple layout reveals what its conventional aspect tends to hide: this "commentary only" format comprises not only Gilbert's commentary, but also nearly the entire text of the Psalter. Virtually every word of every phrase in every psalm is expounded, so that the text of the psalm is present, encapsulated in the commentary. The lemmata are sometimes written out in full, and identified as the words of Scripture by means of underlining in red, black or yellow; a few manuscripts even have the lemmata entirely in red.⁴⁴ More often the psalm text is abbreviated, the first words of the verse given in full, the end of the text sometimes disintegrating into a string of initials in the interest of economy of space, time and parchment. Despite this interpolated repetition of the psalms in this "simple" format, one would be hard pressed to reconstruct each psalm from the lemmata provided, since the order of words and even of verses is often scrambled beyond recognition.

The majority of the manuscripts of Gilbert's Psalms commentary, however, preserve the distinctive *cum textu* format.⁴⁵ These manuscripts

⁴² See Häring, "Commentary and Hermeneutics", (especially p. 176) and "Handschriftliches" for many examples. In the twelfth century Gilbert's commentaries on the Psalms and Epistles were known collectively as the *media glosatura*, to be distinguished from Peter Lombard's longer *magna glosatura* on the same two books.

⁴³ Alberic of Trois Fontaines, *Chronica*, MGH SS 23:840: "fecit minorem glosaturam continuam"; thirteenth century marginal notes added to Robert of Auxerre, (ob. 1212), "a Gislebarto continuative productam"; cited in Häring, "Commentary and Hermeneutics," 180n. William of Nangis, *Chronicle* (for year 1158), "a Gilbert Porree continuative productam"; cited in Maurice Simon, "La glose de l'Épître aux Romains de Gilbert de la Porrée," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 52 (1957): 54. Also see Smalley, "Gilbertus Universalis," 31.

⁴⁴ MS Durham A.111.10, for example, has red lemmata. The use of underlining is notoriously inconsistent even in the earlier manuscripts.

⁴⁵ By my count, among the 51 twelfth-century manuscripts of the Psalms com-

are laid out to accomodate two columns per page, the inner column (toward the spine) reserved for the complete text of the Psalms in large script, and the outer column, two to three times as wide, for the commentary, which is written in a smaller hand and on more narrowly-ruled lines. The relative width of the two columns is adjusted from page to page to insure that the psalm and its comment will begin and end reasonably in tandem. In this format, the text of each psalm still appears in due course in the commentary, but is in general much more severely abbreviated than the lemmata in the simple, traditional treatise format described above.

The utility of this format for users of the commentary who might not necessarily have the entire Psalter by heart is self-evident. Although essentially the entire psalm text is present (as lemmata) in the simple format, it proves impossible to reconstruct a given psalm without reference to the original. This would seem an unimportant consideration, except that Gilbert was greatly preoccupied with reading the psalms as cohesive and coherent literary units.⁴⁶ Without the entire psalm text present, whether on parchment or in memory, much of Gilbert's exposition loses force and clarity. Gilbert's insistence on treating the psalms as integral units, rather than strings of verses, mandates an awareness of each psalm as a complete entity; and for the average non-monastic student, this would require a certain amount of prompting.⁴⁷ The placement of the psalm text alongside the commentary guarantees the student immediate access to the work being glossed, despite possible lapses of memory.

But an incomplete mastery of the entire Psalter is not the only obstacle to reconstructing the individual psalms from the lemmata provided. Gilbert continually explores the exegetical possibilities of alternative word order, realigning words and phrases to unlock veiled

mentary there are 19 with the *cum textu* format, and 21 without; I have not yet been able to determine the layout of the 11 remaining manuscripts. For the manuscripts of Gilbert's commentary on the *Opuscula sacra* of Boethius, most of which also appear in this format, see Nikolaus M. Häring, *The Commentaries on Boethius of Gilbert of Poitiers* (Toronto, 1966), 15.

⁴⁶ This will be pursued in chapter three. Van Elswijk hints at Gilbert's holistic approach in his article "Gilbert Porreta als glossator van het Psalterium," 292, mentioning only a certain "unity of thought" which pervades the commentary.

⁴⁷ Certainly, the Book of Psalms was probably the best-known segment of the Bible, and was generally used as a reading primer; a synonym for "literate" was *psalteratus*. See Pierre Riché, *Écoles et enseignement dans le Haut Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1979), 223. Still, a young cleric was not likely to have internalized the entire Psalter as would a monk who recited all 150 Psalms in the course of each week.

meaning. Responding to echos and allusions within the psalm, he often recombines discrete verse segments in order to clarify the Psalmist's message.⁴⁸ In addition, Gilbert occasionally offers more than one mode of interpreting a section of a psalm or an entire psalm, as he does in the case of Psalm 138, *Domini, probasti me*. In doing so he skips backwards and forwards through the text with dizzying facility, wreaking havoc on the narrative order of the psalm, until in his conclusion he pulls it all together again. One quite despairs of following him without the text of the psalm before one's eyes. To make the chaos complete, Gilbert also frequently takes note of common textual variants, so that when he is finished with his exposition the original psalm text is all but unrecognizable.⁴⁹ The scribes responsible for transcribing Gilbert's commentary often were driven to distraction by these habits of Gilbert's, losing track of what, by rights, ought to be underlined as lemmata: some scribes responded by scoring every word of Scripture which occurred in the course of the commentary; some clearly attempted to underline only the first appearance of each verse; most ultimately quit in frustration before the end of the lengthy commentary.

The parallel-column *cum textu* format is a unique contribution of Gilbert to biblical exegesis. The introduction of a biblical text alongside its commentary may strike one as a practical, even natural development, but in fact it is remarkable. Obviously, the appearance of a text and its glosses together on the same page was not without precedent; marginal and interlinear glosses have a long history. A commonplace in the schoolrooms of the ninth century already was the text of Vergil, Donatus or Cicero, larded with marginal and

⁴⁸ Gilbert explains his method in the "Prologus primus" (actually the second, post-1148 preface) to his commentaries on Boethius: "... nos—in genere lectorum non recitatorum sed interpretum officio facientes—verborum transpositiones in ordinem, scemata in consequentiam, novitates in regulam, addentes singulorum causas, reducimus." Ed. Häring, *The Commentaries on Boethius*, 54.

⁴⁹ Häring notes this in relation to Gilbert's commentary on Boethius, adding that the presence of Boethius' text makes the manuscripts much easier to read and understand than the printed edition! "The Commentaries of Gilbert of Poitiers on Boethius," in *Nine Medieval Thinkers*, ed. J. Reginald O'Donnell (Toronto, 1955), 23. Peter Lombard was to use a variation of Gilbert's format, and for the same reasons. Instead of the dual-column *cum textu* format, he presents the Psalm text a verse or two at a time, followed by commentary (and does the same for his Epistles commentary). See Marcia L. Colish, "From *Sacra pagina* to *theologia*: Peter Lombard as an Exegete of Romans," in *Medieval Perspectives*, Southeastern Medieval Association 6 (1991): 2. De Hamel denies Peter, like Gilbert, any involvement in the design of the format used in his commentaries; *Glossed Books*, 27.

interlinear wisdom.⁵⁰ A mid-ninth century manuscript, originally from Tours, of Priscian's *Institutiones Grammaticae* illustrates the method: shorter 'glosses in a minuscule hand between the lines of the text, and longer glosses erratically spaced in the unruled margins, roughly where appropriate. The difficulty of always aligning the gloss and the text was addressed by means of a more or less elaborate array of tie marks (sometimes nothing more than letters of the alphabet or line/dot combinations, in the case of this Priscian manuscript, some rather imaginative squiggles) which indicate matching lemma and gloss when necessary.⁵¹

By the end of the eleventh century, this useful marginal/interlinear arrangement had been borrowed from profane letters and put to use by teachers of the sacred page.⁵² In a spurt of vitality after the long and not satisfactorily explained dearth of exegetical activity in the tenth century,⁵³ the *catenae* of the Carolingian masters, originally written out as continuous expositions,⁵⁴ were variously recombined and arranged around a central column of Scripture. A handsome and successful (*i.e.* readable) example from the eleventh century is the marginal and interlinear gloss of the Psalter in manuscript Paris BN latin 11550. The marginal glosses in this manuscript are ruled continuously with the scriptural text in the center of the page, but the central text is written only on every other line, in larger script;

⁵⁰ For glossed profane texts, see John O. Ward, "From Antiquity to the Renaissance: Glosses and Commentaries on Cicero's *Rhetorica*," *Medieval Eloquence*, ed. James J. Murphy (Berkeley, 1978): 25–67; R. W. Hunt, "Studies on Priscian in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries", in *MARS* 1 (1941–43): 194–231 and 2 (1950): 1–55; Mary Dickey, "Some Commentaries on the *de inventione* and *ad Herennium* of the Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries," in *MARS* 6 (1968): 1–41. All three scholars make the point that these are by no means necessarily elementary glosses.

⁵¹ MS Autun Bibliothèque Municipale 40, originally from Tours; E. K. Rand, *A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours* (Cambridge, Mass., 1929) vol. 2, pl. 120 (no. 106).

⁵² For a concise and fairly up to date summary, see G. Lobrichon, "Une nouveauté: les gloses de la Bible," 98–99.

⁵³ Beryl Smalley argued that the culprit was Cluny, or rather the "shift of interest" to emphasize liturgy over study, moving the Psalter (in particular) from the cloister to the choir; *Study*, 44–45. E. Ann Matter proposes instead that the school of Auxerre (Haimo, Heiric and Remigius) was the culmination of Carolingian exegesis, and that "only the new set of problems posed by the Scholastic age" would reinvigorate a mummified scholarship; "Exegesis and Christian Tradition: The Carolingian Model," in *Schools of Thought in the Christian Tradition*, ed. Patrick Henry (Philadelphia, 1984), 102.

⁵⁴ See E. Ann Matter, *ibid.*, who allows that at least some of the Carolingians flirted with originality; also see Ceslaus Spicq, *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1944), 9–60, who is less generous.

in this way the visual distinction between gloss and glossed text is immediately clear. Quite unrelated to the *Glossa ordinaria*, this modest collection of patristic and Carolingian glosses is evidence that a high degree of sophistication in page layout was achieved a century before Parisian scribes began producing the books of the *Glossa ordinaria* in quantity.⁵⁵

Of course, many more marginal and interlinear glossed books were not so successfully laid out, but they proliferated none the less. These *gloses périmées*, as Beryl Smalley has christened them, were ubiquitous in the schools, and not unknown in the cloisters: Peter the Venerable leaves us with an image of a monk whose intellectual curiosity, as strong as his piety, prompted him to carry a glossed Psalter at all times, even into the choir.⁵⁶

Whether as adjuncts to sacred or profane texts, then, marginal and interlinear glosses had long been familiar aids to teaching and study. How close does this bring us to an appreciation of the use of the two-column *cum textu* format for Gilbert's commentary? If one were to accept the opinion which holds Gilbert's Psalms commentary to be a mere concatenation of the individual glosses of the *Glossa ordinaria*, it would bring us very close indeed; all Gilbert would have had to do is pull the comments out of their niches and line them up next to the central column of Scripture, which is then nudged over to the side.⁵⁷ But this would be both to oversimplify the physical

⁵⁵ Pace de Hamel, who theorizes that this page layout was invented by professional scribes in Paris, after the death of Peter Lombard, and only subsequently applied to the *Glossa ordinaria*. De Hamel calls this type of continuously-ruled text and bible gloss an "entirely new feature" in the 1160s; *Glossed Books*, 22 and passim. P. Stirnemann questions his theory in her review of *Glossed Books* in *Bulletin Monumental* 143 (1985): 366.

⁵⁶ B. Smalley, "Les commentaires bibliques de l'époque romane." "Psalmidia indeficiens, scripturarum sanctarum nocte dieque meditatio, propter quod et psalterium glossatum semper circumferebat, quoniam psalmos non perfunctorie, ut quibusdam moris est, sed summa cum attentione atque devotione cantabat": Peter the Venerable, *De miraculis*, i.20 (*PL* 189:886); cited in Jean Leclercq, *Pierre le Venerable* (St-Wandrille, 1946), 109.

⁵⁷ De Hamel maintains that neither Gilbert's nor the Lombard's similar *layouts* (he is not discussing the commentary itself) had evolved from the marginal/interlinear glossed page. By his reckoning, scribes "reintroduced" the Psalms and Epistles texts to copies of Peter Lombard's commentaries when the latter "replaced" the *Glossa ordinaria* on these books, so that these portions of a glossed set of the Bible still "carried their respective shares of the [Bible] text"; *Glossed Books*, 20, 24, 27. However, when the Lombard or Gilbert are represented in such sets (which are rare and always partial), as in the *bibliotheca* of Prince Henry, they are there in addition to, not in place of, the *Glossa ordinaria* on those books. See also chap. 5 below.

exigencies of glossing a text, and to underestimate the originality in Gilbert's commentary.

Gilbert's Psalms commentary, as we will confirm in the next three chapters, displays a degree of internal cohesion and organization of argument which is inconsistent with the very nature of the marginal and interlinear gloss. It is transparently programmatic (not to say "systematic"), and although it drinks deeply at the same Anselmian well as does the established *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms, the relationship between the two is clearly not unilateral. Gilbert conceived of and wrote his commentary as a continuous treatise, in that sense hearkening back to the Carolingian model,⁵⁸ but no Carolingian scriptural commentary appears side by side with Scripture itself; the use of the *cum textu* format in Gilbert's Psalms commentary is unprecedented.

Unprecedented, that is, in the world of biblical exegesis. In fact, the format is perfectly at home in commented texts of a secular nature. From the late antique period on, continuous commentaries on the classics are frequently presented *cum textu*. Donatus, Priscian, Boethius, Macrobius—all the stars in the liberal arts constellation are to be found in company with their expositions,⁵⁹ in the exact same format utilized in Gilbert's commentary. Among the plethora of examples one could cite,⁶⁰ I call attention to an eleventh-century manuscript in Paris, B.N. lat. 16236, which includes the commentary of Servius on Vergil's *Aeneid*.⁶¹ This manuscript provides an excellent illustration of the virtuosity achieved by the most talented artists of the *mise en page*

⁵⁸ Continuous commentaries were produced in monastic environments in the late eleventh and early twelfth century, but Gilbert does not seem to take much inspiration from them; see chapter 4.

⁵⁹ Not only were the classic school texts commented, but also the great commentaries on them which had become classics in turn, such as Macrobius' treatise on the *Dream of Scipio*, glossed by William of Conches. See Edouard Jeuneau, "La Lecture des auteurs classiques à l'école de Chartres durant la première moitié du XII^e siècle," in *Classical Influences on European Culture AD 500–1500*, ed. R. R. Bolgar (Cambridge, 1971), 95–102.

⁶⁰ Random examples: Paris B.N. lat. 7926, eleventh century, commentary of Servius (ca. 400 A.D.) on the *Aeneid*; B.N. lat. 7900, tenth century, commentary of Acron (2nd century A.D.) on the *Odes* of Horace. Also see Vatican Urb. lat. 532, ninth century, a gloss of the *Contra Eutychen et Nestorium* of Boethius, in Rand, *Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours*, vol. 2, pl. 32 (no. 20).

⁶¹ Paris B.N. lat. 16236 (olim Sorbonne 511), late tenth century; texts of Vergil, including *Aeneid*, with commentaries by Servius. A page of this manuscript is reproduced in Émile L. M. Chatelaine, *Paléographie des classiques latins* (Paris, 1884–92), part 1, pl. 70.

in the generation or two before Gilbert. Vergil's text is written out in large letters, and the commentary in script half that size, on continuously scored pages.⁶² On many pages, the Vergilian text occupies the inner of two columns, and the Servian commentary marches in step down the wider outer column; the format is identical in every respect to the "gilbertine" layout, even to the underlining of the lemmata in the commentary text. On other pages, however, the format varies: sometimes the Vergilian text takes up two columns side by side, with the commentary evenly arranged across the page above and below, or the subject text will be surrounded on three sides by the commentary, always on continuously-ruled lines, and always with very little in the way of stretching and squeezing to keep commentary and text in balance, leaving the impression that the scribe had carefully worked out his ratios in advance, or had an exemplar which had done so. It is obvious that the scribe could have done the whole thing in the "gilbertine" *cum textu* format, had he wished to do so; perhaps his aesthetic preferred variety to homogeneity.

The employment of the two-column *cum textu* arrangement in the majority of manuscripts of Gilbert's commentary reinforces our awareness that this commentary is not the product of, nor intended for use in, a contemplative environment, but is rather more at home in the secular schools where the addition of the Scriptural text alongside the treatise would provide a familiar, handy, and altogether welcome reference.⁶³ Gilbert was without doubt accustomed to similar presentations of the commented classics, and in the context of his extensive study of the trivium,⁶⁴ it is not at all surprising that he would hit upon the concept of borrowing the *cum textu* format for a schoolroom commentary on the Psalms, just as a few generations earlier, teachers of Scripture had borrowed the marginal/interlinear glossing method from the study of the pagan authors. Indeed,

⁶² It employs, in fact, the "alternate-line" page layout.

⁶³ Cf. Jean Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*, trans. C. Misrahi (New York, 1961) [originally published as *L'amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu* (Paris, 1957)], esp. chap. 5, "Sacred Learning".

⁶⁴ Though Chartres was conspicuous for its teaching of the liberal arts, we are reminded that Anselm of Laon also glossed Vergil (and probably Lucan and Statius) and was famous for teaching profane literature as well as sacred. See B. Bischoff, "Living with the Satirists," in *Classical Influences*, 84; also Hunt, "Studies on Priscian," 222-3. Among contemporary testimony we note that of Guibert of Nogent, who calls Anselm the "light of France" in the liberal arts: *De vita sua*, ed. E.-R. Labande (Paris, 1981).

Gilbert enjoyed a reputation among his contemporaries for his commitment to putting all of the *artes* in the service of sacred science.⁶⁵ In his second prologue to his commentaries on Boethius, written toward the end of his life, he described how he approached the challenge of expounding a text with all the resources which the *artes* had to offer:⁶⁶ for the Gilbert who thirty years earlier was just commencing his career, these resources already included the practical *mise en page* of the profane school glosses.

We have perhaps succeeded in showing that Gilbert had both the motive and the inspiration for providing his commentary with a built-in reference when he released it for circulation; but this is far from establishing that he actually did so. Unfortunately, it cannot be proven absolutely that he did, unless one were to discover a set of instructions written by Gilbert to a scribe, or his holograph mapping out the relation of comment to text. Nonetheless, having established the reasonableness of the proposition, we may proceed to disallow the objections offered against it.

No more needs to be said concerning the claim that the two-column *cum textu* format was an entirely new development, not invented until after the death of Peter Lombard. As to whether or not the earliest exemplars of Gilbert's commentary employed this layout, that cannot be determined by manuscript evidence alone. The second earliest securely datable manuscript, that which belonged to Robert of Chesney (ob. 1166),⁶⁷ contains only the commentary; it is described in chancellor Hamo's catalogue as being (and is in fact) "*sine textu*".⁶⁸ However, Hamo himself donated his own copy of Gilbert's Psalms commentary to the cathedral chapter, too; it is still in Lincoln, and is, as Hamo's catalogue duly notes, "*simul cum textu*".⁶⁹

⁶⁵ John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, c.12, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall as *Memoirs of the Papal Court* (London, 1956), 27.

⁶⁶ Gilbert's "Prologus primus," ed. Häring, *The Commentaries on Boethius*, 44–45. M.-D. Chenu was the first to recognize that Gilbert explicitly formulated the principle of the application to theology of the techniques of the other disciplines: "Un essai de méthode théologique au XXI^e siècle," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 24 (1935): 258–267, esp. 260.

⁶⁷ MS Oxford Balliol 36; see p. 31 above.

⁶⁸ Woolley, *Catalogue*, v; Hamo was made chancellor around 1150.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, viii. Hamo was proud of this gift: it is the first listed of the three books comprising his donation, right below his name, and he notes fondly its handsome red binding (unfortunately now lost). De Hamel suggests an English provenance and a date of 1160–1170 for the manuscript on the basis of script and illumination, though Hamo was chancellor from ca. 1150: *Glossed Books*, 20.

Even earlier is manuscript Troyes 488, one of the books made for Prince Henry around 1140;⁷⁰ this is the earliest extant datable manuscript, and it too is without Psalm text. However, the manuscript is uncharacteristic in other ways: an extremely elegant and finely made codex on very fine vellum, with a somewhat austere aesthetic (including the restrained use of gilding in the illuminated capitals) but in impeccable taste, this is without doubt a luxury copy. As noted, there is no additional Psalm text; instead, the lemmata are written out with only the most minimal abbreviation. Other apparatus features characteristic of manuscripts containing Gilbert's commentary are also missing: the comments to each psalm are not numbered, the references supplied to identify the *auctoritates* cited in the comments are sharply curtailed, and Gilbert's cross index is omitted entirely. Curious also is the fact that prince Henry's copy of Gilbert's commentary is divided into three equal parts by gilt initials at Psalms 1, 51 and 101, instead of following the "liturgical" division to which Gilbert's commentary is generally subjected.⁷¹ The manuscript's pristine condition suggests that it was not much used. The princely young future-prelate was no scholar, though it is precisely for non-scholars that de Hamel considers the *cum textu* format to have been invented.⁷² Also, this manuscript (and the companion volume of Gilbert's Epistles commentary, also *sine textu*)⁷³ were evidently commissioned as part of

⁷⁰ See above, p. 30.

⁷¹ The liturgical division (at Psalms 1, 26, 38, 52, 68, 80, 97, 109) and the "biblical" (at 1, 41, 72, 89, 106) are far more common in Psalters in general than is this tripartite division; manuscripts of Gilbert's commentary almost invariably adopt the liturgical, though sometimes, in addition, Psalms 51 and 101 will also receive a fancy capital. Gilbert explicitly denies the validity of the "biblical" division in his Prologue (see below, p. 92); I have never seen it used in the manuscripts. One can scarcely imagine these manuscripts actually to have been used for the recitation of the Divine Office, yet that is not impossible; Leroquais includes some manuscripts of Gilbert's commentary in his discussion of liturgical psalters precisely because the Psalms text is present, and in principle they could be so employed; *Psautiers*, vol. 1, xlix-l. I have only come across one case in which that possibility is implied by the manuscript itself: in Tours Bibl. Mun. 93 (12th century), each psalm is followed by an anthem (which is, needless to say, not glossed by Gilbert). Leroquais, however, cites many marginal/interlinear glossed Psalters endowed with anthems as well as various liturgies and offices; *ibid.*, xlix; and we also have Peter the Venerable's anecdote (see above, p. 40). The only explanation which I can offer for the very consistent employment of the liturgical sequence for Gilbert's commentary was that it was very familiar, so that elaborate capitals at the head of these eight psalms provided frequent and conveniently spaced visual signposts for quickly finding one's place in the commentary. That is, at least, what I have used them for.

⁷² De Hamel, *Glossed Books*, 19.

⁷³ MS Troyes Bibl. Mun. 2266.

a *bibliotheca* of glossed biblical books, yet is specifically for such *bibliothecae*, de Hamel argues, that the *cum textu* format was introduced.⁷⁴ The obvious conclusion is that the commission for Henry's luxury volume set of glossed texts was long on aesthetics and short on concern for scholarly apparatus.

Finally, though it cannot be dated by external evidence, manuscript 988 of the municipal library of Troyes appears the earliest on stylistic grounds.⁷⁵ It is not only *cum textu* but also endowed with all the other scholarly aids omitted from the copy owned by Henry: cross-index, references, numbers.

In connection with his edition of Gilbert's commentaries on Boethius, which employ the same format, Nicholas Häring raised a more serious objection to the idea of Gilbert's responsibility for the employment of the *cum textu* format. Häring makes the point that in the manuscripts of these commentaries, the text of Boethius given in the inner columns is not always identical to that given in the lemmata in the body of the commentary. From this Häring concludes that the Boethius text was added later, and not by Gilbert himself.⁷⁶ This argument is not as convincing as it appears at first glance. It is clear that at least in the case of the Psalms, Gilbert was not presupposing a single (much less definitive) version of his text. In his Psalms commentary, Gilbert repeatedly takes note of variant readings available to his students. No attempt whatsoever is made to decide upon one reading over another, no emendations or corrections are stated; rarely does he even indicate a preference. Gilbert simply provides an explanation for each variant of which he is aware; they almost never seriously alter the sense of the interpretation. "*Habent quidam libri 'in generationes generationem', alii 'in generatione et generationem', alii 'in seculam seculari', quae omnia una sensu iunguntur*" says Gilbert appropos of Psalm 71:5, in an altogether typical instance.⁷⁷

It is interesting that Gilbert does not similarly accommodate multiple variants of his Boethian text, when he goes to such lengths to do so in his Psalms commentary. One would like to know if this were an indication that his critical faculties had developed in the

⁷⁴ De Hamel, *Glossed Books*, 24.

⁷⁵ See p. 34 above.

⁷⁶ Häring, *The Commentaries on Boethius*, 43–46.

⁷⁷ MS Paris, B.N. lat. 12004, fol. 92r; the Vulgate now opts for Gilbert's second offering. "Tu 'haereditabis', vel 'disperdes', quod idem est" says Gilbert appropos of Ps 81:8 (B.N. lat. 12004 fol. 112r); the Vulgate has "haereditabis".

course of his career, that he became willing to make textual emendations suggested by the logic of the context, grammatical consistency, or his notion of the intention of the author; but this is not the case. Häring finds absolutely no evidence that Gilbert “doctored” the text(s) of Boethius which he used in order to arrive at certain readings (such as the notorious *quo* instead of the *quod* in the modern editions), which is to say that every reading given in Gilbert’s *lemmata* is attested in the available manuscripts.⁷⁸ A far more likely, though more prosaic, explanation for the absence of variants noted by Gilbert is that copies of Boethius were not so readily available as copies of the Psalter, and therefore Gilbert was far less aware of textual variants.⁷⁹ A false impression of Gilbert’s interest in textual criticism might be had from his occasional employment of secondary sources, primarily Jerome, to elucidate words through their Greek or Hebrew equivalents. This is not textual criticism however; Gilbert does not choose one variant over another based on the meaning of the Greek or Hebrew, but rather uses the new definition to provide nuance to his gloss.⁸⁰

Certainly neither emendation nor ignorance of variants rears its head in Gilbert’s Psalms commentary. Instead, we are reminded that twelfth century readers were aware of the absence of a definitive, critical edition of the Bible, and were not overly concerned about it.⁸¹ This *laissez-faire* attitude need not dismay us; in fact Gilbert was

⁷⁸ Häring, *Commentaries on Boethius*, 46. It was Gilbert’s controversial use of the ablative to resolve a question concerning the Persons of the Trinity which brought him before the consistory of Reims in 1148. Note that critical emendation can become criminal emendation where theology is concerned!

⁷⁹ Ralph J. Hexter postulates this reason for the lack of critical emendation in twelfth-century texts of Ovid; *Ovid and Medieval Schooling: Studies in Medieval School Commentaries* . . . (Munich, 1986), 217.

⁸⁰ See A. M. Landgraf, “Zur Methode der biblischen Textkritik im 12. Jahrhundert,” *Biblica* 10 (1929): 445–474. He provides examples from Gilbert’s Epistles commentary, 456–467.

⁸¹ Gilbert and his contemporaries generally used the gallican psalter (Jerome’s translation utilizing Origen’s *Hexaples*), which had widely replaced the so-called Roman psalter (an early European Latin version) by Charlemagne’s order. But no sooner had the gallican version been imposed than old usages immediately began to creep back into the text; along with local tradition and faulty transmission of texts, it is a marvel that there is as little variation in the text as there is; Lerōquais, *Psautiers*, xxix–xxxiii. The existence of “double” and “triple” psalters, aligning the gallican version with the “hebrew”, the Roman or the Septuagint show the awareness and interest in the multiplicity of versions. Compare Abelard’s famous “aut codex mendosus est, aut interpres erravit” in *Sic et Non*; yet he never goes as far as to suggest emendations to Scriptural text.

merely following Cassiodorus' sage advice, that not only were all books of the Bible divinely inspired, but their many translations as well—a perspective which obviates the need to choose between variant readings.⁸² Besides, revealed texts are not lightly emended; one might venture to correct an obviously faulty text of Boethius, but who can define the “logic” of revelation?⁸³ It was generally conceded that the sense of Scripture was not always readily apparent, because of the immense distance between the Word as it exists in God's mind and the human language in which it must be transmitted. Gilbert's duty as a teacher, as he saw it, was not to try to establish a critical edition of the Psalter, but rather to arm his students for every textual exigency.

This still leaves us with a need to explain why some words of the Psalms might vary from one *cum textu* manuscript to the next. For answer, we must turn to the mechanics of *mise en page*. To produce a marginal/interlinear glossed text, the scribe would write out the subject text first, then go back and insert the explanatory material however it best fit. The latter operation was rendered infinitely simpler if the scribe was merely copying from an exemplar, of course; matters became far more complicated if he was engaged in compiling a set of glosses from various sources, an operation which frequently challenged his talents beyond their limits, if we consider the evidence of some of the less attractive and less legible *gloses périmées* with their jumbled and crowded marginalia and bewildering proliferation of tie-marks.

The two-column *cum textu* format, however, was produced in a different order. In this case, the scribe first wrote out the commentary, the longer and arguably more important text, and only then did he—or a colleague—return to supply the subject text, stretching or squeezing the words to fit what has in fact become the marginal space.⁸⁴ The regularity of the disposition of the commentary in its column, as opposed to the sometimes procrustean treatment of the Psalms text, testifies to this method. Also, the increasing tendency to write the text in a more calligraphic script than the commentary

⁸² Cassiodorus, *Expositio Psalmorum*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL 97–98; Praefatio c.15; see J.-M. Courtès, “Figures et tropes dans le psautier de Cassiodore,” *Revue des études latines* 43 (1964): 365.

⁸³ Cf. 1 Cor. 1:20.

⁸⁴ Laura Light, *The Bible in the Twelfth Century. An Exhibition of MSS at the Houghton Library* (Cambridge, Mass., 1988), 96.

further suggests a division of labor in the scriptorium.⁸⁵

With this in mind it is easy to see how the text of the Psalms might include variations from manuscript to manuscript: as each religious establishment, monastic or secular, was habituated to the subtle idiosyncracies of its own local usage in psalmody, a copyist would tend to slip remembered locutions, consciously or not, into his half-mechanical transcription of the Psalm text, irrespective of the exemplar before his eyes. Professional scribes were not the only ones who displayed this revisionism; subsequent readers of Gilbert's *cum textu* commentary occasionally succumbed to the urge to "emend" the Psalms text in the manuscript before them to their own preferred reading.⁸⁶ Furthermore, this was not done only in the Psalms text column: in one instance, the copyist could not bear to relinquish the "*olla*" to which he was accustomed, and substituted it for the "*lebes*" of the gallican version—and he does this in the lemmata, for this manuscript is not *cum textu*.⁸⁷

The same caveat applies to the column of scriptural text in the *Glossa ordinaria* or any marginal/interlinear biblical gloss. Variations are just as common there, and for the same reasons as in the Psalms text column of Gilbert's *cum textu* manuscripts. There too one finds readers emending the text to suit their own preferred usage.⁸⁸

Clearly, variations in the text of the Psalms are no more incompatible with Gilbert's authorization of the *cum textu* format than are variations in the lemmata of a *sine textu* manuscript, and no one would argue that those were a later addition to Gilbert's commentary. In light of the close and (in the realm of scriptural exegesis) exclusive identification of the dual-column *cum textu* format with Gilbert's Psalms commentary, the appropriateness of the format to the type of com-

⁸⁵ For example, the tenth century script used to write the text of *Contra Eutychem et Nestorium* in MS Vatican Urb. lat. 532 is identical but for size to the script used in the commentary; similarly, the stately script used for the Psalm text in MS Troyes Bibl. Mun. 988 (early 12th century) contrasts with the identifiably "gothic" script in the text column of MS Tours Bibl. Mun. 93 (from mid-century). For the suggestion that gothic script was invented intentionally to "slow down" the reader of scriptural texts, see de Hamel, *Glossed Books*, 36. Cf. N. R. Ker, *English Manuscripts in the Century after the Norman Conquest* (Oxford, 1960), 2–3.

⁸⁶ For this phenomenon, see William MacBain, "Remembrance of Things Still to Come: Scribal Memory and Manuscript Tradition," *Manuscripta* 31 (1987): 77–88; also see Leroquais, *Psautiers* xxxiii.

⁸⁷ MS Paris Bibl. Mazarine 202, fol. 145, apropos of Psalm 107. The modern Vulgate edition has "*lebes*".

⁸⁸ Smalley, "Les commentaires bibliques de l'époque romane," 19.

mentary, Gilbert's own familiarity with the useful layout, and the lack of tenable objections against it, we will accept the *cum textu* format as original and intrinsic to Gilbert's commentary.

Considering the degree of scribal expertise (as well as the additional parchment) involved in successfully laying out the *cum textu* format, it is a testimony to its usefulness that it is represented in the majority of the twelfth-century manuscripts of all of Gilbert's commentaries. Still, the easier to produce and more economical *sine textu* model gave the more elaborate option some stiff competition. At least one of these, as we have seen, was a luxury copy, though;⁸⁹ so cost was not the only deciding factor. A wealthy monastic establishment with plenty of psalters on hand might well dispense with a *cum textu* layout, while a successful *magister* might judge the extra expense worthwhile. We can compare, for example, the elegant *sine textu* manuscript Paris B.N. lat. 14419, a jewel in the thirteenth-century library of Saint-Victor, to the utilitarian *cum textu* Paris B.N. lat. 439.⁹⁰

Besides the visually striking *cum textu* layout, a seemingly minor yet significant element of Gilbert's format is the use of marginal references to indicate his patristic and Carolingian sources. This is not a gilbertine innovation; such marginal indications occur in manuscripts of glossed scriptural texts from at least the late Carolingian period to identify the sources for citations and paraphrases contained in the text.⁹¹ Still, the very consistent use of these references in Gilbert's commentary suggests that it was considered a virtually inalienable component of the format. Out of the forty-seven manuscripts for which I have the relevant information, only two do not include these references; they also lack the index symbols, *cum textu* format, psalm numbers, underlined lemmata and paragraph dividers normally present

⁸⁹ MS Troyes Bibl. Mun. 488; above, p. 44.

⁹⁰ Rarely are we able to know the original owners of these manuscripts, so it is difficult to say who commissioned which type of format.

⁹¹ Malcolm B. Parkes, "The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book," in *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to R. W. Hunt*, ed. J. J. G. Alexander and M. T. Gibson (Oxford, 1976), 116. Marginal references were employed in that milestone of scholarly organization, the *Elementarium doctrinae erudimentum* (the "Dictionary") of Papias, mid eleventh-century; Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse, "*Statim invenire*: Schools, Preachers and New Attitudes to the Page," in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), 203. They are found in commentaries on canon law at least from the 1140s; Stephan Kuttner, *Repertorium der Kanonistik (1140–1234)*; Studi et testi 71 (Vatican, 1937), 10–12.

in manuscripts of Gilbert's commentary.⁹² Gilbert's responsibility for his references has been questioned, but as in the case of the *cum textu* format, there is little support for such doubt. Aside from the overwhelming manuscript evidence, we know that Vincent of Beauvais and Peter Lombard wrote their own marginal references; and as will be seen when we turn to Gilbert's use of his sources, it would not always have been easy for someone else to find and identify his sources, changed as they are once Gilbert has done with them.⁹³

As helpful as it is, the practice has its drawbacks. Marginal references tended to get dislocated from their proper position in the margin, away from the passage they were meant to signal; for this reason, some authors came to put their references "*inter lineas ipsas*", right in the text, not in the margins where they were so easily lost or transposed.⁹⁴ Furthermore, even when accurate, the references can be maddeningly vague: 'Ier', for example, could mean Jerome's (incomplete) series of homilies on the Psalms or any of his exegetical writings, prologues, letters or treatises. Still, though neither exhaustive nor infallible, marginal references remained in use because they were found to be useful: they reassured the more intellectually timid that here, indeed, were "authorial" truths which one could trust, as opposed to mere "magisterial" statements of opinion.⁹⁵ Secondly, for

⁹² Both MSS are also incomplete: Paris B.N. lat. 2577, Carpentras 13. Where I have been able to check, the references are remarkably consistent from one manuscript to the next, given the vagaries of scribal transmission. A similar finding is reported by Valerie I. J. Flint, concerning the manuscripts of the *Expositio Psalterii* of Honorius Augustodunensis; "Some Notes on the Early Twelfth Century Commentaries on the Psalms," *RTAM* 38 (1971): 82n.

⁹³ Having denied to Gilbert the authorship of the *cum textu* format and the cross-index symbols, de Hamel is ambiguous about whether the references are truly the work of Gilbert; *Glossed Books*, 32. For Vincent of Beauvais, see n. 95 below. I. Brady established definitively that Peter Lombard was responsible for the marginalia of his Book of Sentences, which is heavily dependent on his own Psalms and Epistles commentaries; "The Rubrics of Peter Lombard's Sentences," *Pier Lombardo* 6 (1962): 5-25.

⁹⁴ Thus Vincent of Beauvais, in the prologue to *Speculum maius*, ed. A.-D. v. den Brincken, "Geschichtsbetrachtung bei Vincenz von Beauvais. Die Apologia Actoris zum Speculum Maius," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 34 (1978): 468; cited in A. J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia, 1988), 157.

⁹⁵ That the patristic *expositor* and the magisterial *glosator* might be confused was even more a concern than the mixing up of patristic authorities themselves: "Ne Cassiodorum pro Augustino sive Ieronimo vel glosatorem inducas pro expositore, in quo interdum non simplices sed eruditiores etiam risimus lectores errasse," Herbert of Bosham, prologue to his edition of Peter Lombard's commentary on the Psalms, MS Cambridge, Trinity College B.5.4, cited by de Hamel, *Glossed Books*, 32. B. Smalley cites other instances of this concern; *Study*, 225-227.

those so inclined, the references allowed (perhaps even encouraged) a return to the *originalia*, to read for oneself the *auctores* in context.⁹⁶ In short, the references are the ancestor of modern footnotes, and had exactly the same function. Gilbert's use of this research tool is indicative both of his respect for the integrity of his sources, and of his desire to use every means possible to facilitate the use of those sources by his students and readers.

The cross-index

We have seen that Gilbert had no monopoly on the first element of the "gilbertine" format, the *cum textu* page layout. On the contrary, the habit of including a subject text side by side with a continuous commentary had been standard practice in the teaching of profane texts, though Gilbert is exceptional and pioneering in applying the technique to biblical commentary. In contrast, the second component of the gilbertine format, the cross-index, is not only uniquely gilbertine, but also specific to his Psalms commentary.⁹⁷ Gilbert devised his cross-index to facilitate the study of the Psalms in an order other than that dictated by the Psalter itself, yet without violating the integrity of the sacred text.

The idea of searchability was not entirely without historical precedent. As early as the third century B.C., for example, alphabetization was pressed into service for organizing large amounts of data which were intractable to a more "rational" order, that is, an order based on subject matter, geographical origin, chronology, or other such criteria. The catalogue of the Library of Alexandria used alphabetization of authors' names, after other breakdowns in rational

⁹⁶ See below, chap. 4, 98–99. See also Parkes, "Ordinatio and Compilatio," 123; G. R. Evans, *The Language and Logic of the Bible: The Earlier Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1984), 70; J. de Ghellinck, "'Originale' et 'originalia,'" *Bulletin du Cange* 14 (1930): 95–105; Minnis, *Authorship*, 155–159; B. Smalley, *Study*, 226.

⁹⁷ Out of the 36 manuscripts for which I have been able to determine the question, 28 have at least a partial set of the index symbols. Out of 26 twelfth-century manuscripts for which I have information, 16 have complete (or nearly so) indexes and four more have partial indexes. Even *sine textu* manuscripts often have the cross-index symbols, so the two format elements are not linked to a single manuscript transmission. In general, the earlier manuscripts tend to be more complete and more accurate, but there are exceptions: MS Troyes 488, as noted above, is indexless. See also footnote 112 below.

categories. But in the classical world, such “artificial” order (that is, order neither rational nor narrative) was resisted. The Roman army, with its infinitude of lists, apparently never used it. The fourth-century treatise of biblical toponymy by Eusebius is alphabetized by first letter; thenceforth, the names are discussed as they occur in the Bible. When Jerome translated this work, he left the order as it was in the Greek, so that the Latin result was no longer perfectly in sequence, rather defeating the purpose.⁹⁸ It is not until the *Elementarium doctrinae erudimentum* of Papias in the mid-eleventh century that a major work arranged in artificial order reappears on the scene.⁹⁹

There seem to be two main reasons for this underutilization of artificial order, namely the preference for narrative or rational order, and the absence of a corpus of data large enough, or an application of data sophisticated enough, to warrant the effort completely to rearrange it and provide the apparatus to search it. Medieval exegetes preferred to work with the narrative order of their subject texts; and as long as their intellectual ambitions or practical needs did not take them beyond this order, there was no necessity to employ finding devices such as subject lists, alphabetical arrangements, indices, and the like.¹⁰⁰

By the time Gilbert was working on his commentary, both the mass of information available to students and the increasingly sophisticated demands being made on the texts resulted in various experiments with imposed order and searchability. Gilbert’s cross-index is one of those rare finding-devices, an early salvo in the barrage of professional apparatus which was to erupt over the course of the twelfth and into the thirteenth century. The function of Gilbert’s cross-index has been correctly described by Richard and Mary Rouse, but the motivation, inspiration, import and future of Gilbert’s cross-index have not yet been addressed.¹⁰¹

The inspiration for the cross-index is not difficult to pinpoint, for there are precious few models available for it. In the course of his study of *sacra pagina* at Laon under the brothers Anselm and Ralph,

⁹⁸ Lloyd W. Daly, *Contribution to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Collection Latomus 90, (Brussels, 1967), 22–25, 59, 65.

⁹⁹ Daly, *Alphabetization*, 71–72. Papias’ lexicon alphabetizes to the third letter, after which, he asserts in his prologue, further order cannot be maintained.

¹⁰⁰ Parkes, “*Ordinatio and Compilatio*,” 117. Rouse and Rouse, “*Statim invenire*,” 209.

¹⁰¹ Richard and Mary Rouse pointed out Cassiodorus as a possible inspiration for Gilbert’s index-system, only to more or less dismiss the idea: “*Statim invenire*,” 204.

Gilbert made, or perhaps deepened, his acquaintance with the *Expositio Psalmorum* of Cassiodorus. The *Expositio* is a tightly structured, study-oriented reduction produced expressly as a more functional alternative to the rambling, homiletic *Enarrationes in Psalmos* of Augustine. The immense popularity of the *Expositio Psalmorum* of Cassiodorus waned only in the course of the twelfth century, probably as a direct result of the success of the *Glossa ordinaria* and the commentaries of Gilbert and Peter Lombard as teaching and study aids.¹⁰²

Gilbert's interest in Cassiodorus went beyond the culling of *flores*, beyond the harvesting of patristic fruit, to the very roots of the *Expositio*. The unswervingly Christocentric, orthodox Chalcedonian fervor of Cassiodorus' commentary finds its place in Gilbert's work, but he found too some of the educational principles behind the *Expositio* to be especially valuable for his own purposes, though the problems he would confront as a master of *sacra pagina* were very nearly a mirror-image of those faced by Cassiodorus. Finding himself in charge of a body of under-educated monastic students who did not share his cultivated background or formal training, Cassiodorus attempted to impart to them a familiarity with the liberal arts by teaching them through the Psalms themselves.¹⁰³ While scholarly activity was by no means central to life at Cassiodorus' monastery of Vivarium, he was certain that his students could not penetrate the complex web of language which both conveyed and shrouded the Psalms' essential truths without the necessary skills to decode the special language by which the Psalter was transposed from divine to human speech.¹⁰⁴ His purpose, in short, was to make of the Psalter a textbook of secular as well as sacred learning.¹⁰⁵ Cassiodorus attempted to facilitate this goal by devising a set of thirteen symbols (mostly consisting of stylized abbreviations) which would serve to flag examples of the liberal arts when they showed up in the course of the Psalms.¹⁰⁶ Since in theory all wisdom and science was comprised in Scripture,¹⁰⁷ this

¹⁰² J. J. O'Donnell, *Cassiodorus* (Berkeley, 1979), 136, 244.

¹⁰³ Cassiodorus, *Expositio psalmorum* (CCSL 97) Praefatio c.15.45–76; see also Helen Kirkby, "The Scholar and his Public," *Boethius, His Life, Thought and Influence* ed. M. T. Gibson (Oxford, 1981), 47; Courtès, "Figures et tropes dans le psautier de Cassiodore," 364.

¹⁰⁴ See discussion of language below, chapter 3, pp. 80–91.

¹⁰⁵ O'Donnell, *Cassiodorus*, 175.

¹⁰⁶ See Appendix I for symbols. Cassiodorus may have drawn on scholastic tradition for the idea; O'Donnell, *ibid.*, 160n.

¹⁰⁷ Cassiodorus, *Ex. Ps.*, praefatio, c.15 (CCSL 97:19–20); he cites Augustine, Jerome,

was not—in theory—as quixotic as it may sound. We are ill-informed as to the success of this ambitious program among the monks at Vivarium, but it probably was not any too effective; at least it was not emulated. Nonetheless, scribes faithfully copied the symbols in the margins of manuscripts of the *Expositio Psalmorum* throughout the Middle Ages.¹⁰⁸

In another attempt to enhance his readers' appreciation of the Psalter, Cassiodorus explains in his Preface that he has determined through observation that each of the Psalms falls into one of twelve categories.¹⁰⁹ The nature of his categories varies wildly, ranging from "psalms beginning with 'Alleluia'" to psalms admonishing "that the Jews should cease their evil ways". Cassiodorus claims that his categories are all allegorical, since the psalms, as prophecies, are all allegories of the life of Christ, but that is the only consistent theme among them. The subject list has rather the appearance of having been padded to make up the mystically correct number twelve. The categories overlap considerably, so that any attempt by the reader actually to assign each psalm to its proper category ends in chaos. Cassiodorus himself does not indicate, in his preface, which psalms belong to which categories; the reader is left on his own to discover this through hints buried in the commentary, frequently in the *conclusio* with which Cassiodorus closes his comments to each psalm. Some of his categories he seems to abandon; on the other hand, he also identifies, in the course of the commentary, other thematically related psalms (such as those relating to the coming of the Antichrist)¹¹⁰ which are not included in his prefatory list of twelve.

When Gilbert launched upon the composition of his own Psalms commentary, he seized upon these two disparate and unsuccessful pedagogical devices—the index system and the categories—and forged

Ambrose and Hilary as his authorities that all wisdom, including the liberal arts, existed in Scripture before profane masters "discovered" them there; see Jerome, *Epistola* 30:1 (*PL* 22:441–441). See Minnis, *Authorship*, 35; Courtès, "Figures et tropes," 362.

¹⁰⁸ Some manuscripts which theoretically would have been available to Gilbert are: Laon 27 (ninth-tenth century), in the library of St-Vincent (now the Bibliothèque Municipale); Chartres Bibl. Mun. 32 and 18 (originally belonging to St-Père) and 20 (from the armarium of the Cathedral chapter, but destroyed in the Second World War), ranging from the ninth to the twelfth centuries. That the symbols continued to be copied in many manuscripts is perhaps a testimony to the efficacy of Cassiodorus' description of their function in his prologue.

¹⁰⁹ See Appendix I.

¹¹⁰ Psalms 9 and 51; see Appendix I.

them into a single functional and useful apparatus.¹¹¹ First of all, he streamlined Cassiodorus' system by redesigning the twelve categories. Certain subjects were retained from Cassiodorus' prefatory list, such as the penitential psalms and the psalms relating to the passion and resurrection. Other categories from the list were jettisoned, their place taken by those alternative subject groups of psalms mentioned by Cassiodorus in the course of his commentary, but not indicated in his preface.

Gilbert further improves on Cassiodorus by immediately identifying the appropriate psalm type in the miniature *accessus* or introduction¹¹² which he provides for each psalm, rather than variably in the introduction, division, explanation or conclusion of each psalm, as Cassiodorus does. Over one-third of the psalms are thus assigned to a specific subject group (54 out of the 150 psalms, with only one overlap), while the rest of the psalms exhibit no particular allegiance other than to the general themes which Gilbert draws up in his Prologue. Then, having reassessed the categories, Gilbert appropriated Cassiodorus' idea of a flagging device to signal, not allusions to *artes*, but the subject categories themselves. His symbols, based on Greek letters and abstract figures, are more fanciful than the simple abbreviations of Cassiodorus.¹¹³

The cross-index operates as follows: each psalm relating to one of Gilbert's new twelve categories is identified as such in the miniature *accessus* which prefaces each segment of commentary. For example, introducing Psalm 20 (*Domini in vertute*), Gilbert notes "This psalm is the third of those which are about Christ's two natures. Before this were [psalms] two and eight; five more will follow."¹¹⁴ Nearby, in the margin, hovers the symbol which represents that category. Above the symbol is a roman numeral which notes where this particular psalm is in the sequence of the several psalms in that category, while below the symbol is another numeral, indicating the number of the next psalm to treat of the same subject. Accordingly, a xxxiiii in the margin of Psalm 21 (*Deus Deus meus*) means that this psalm is the first

¹¹¹ Gilbert's cross-index is given in Appendix I.

¹¹² The *accessus* will be addressed in chapter three.

¹¹³ It is interesting to note that, unlike Cassiodorus' stylized abbreviations (plus a * for 'astronomy'), these are true symbols, arbitrarily assigned to represent subject categories. Some of the symbols are obviously derived from Greek letters, but attempts to interpret them as initials or abbreviations have come to naught.

¹¹⁴ "Iste psalmus est tercius eorum qui sunt de duabus naturis in Christo. Preces-

explicitly about the Passion and Resurrection of Christ (treated at length), and the next psalm on the same subject is Psalm 34. At Psalm 34 (*Iudica Domine*) we indeed find ^{II}_{LIII}, and so forth.

A limitation of Gilbert's indexing system is that it only operates in forward, not in reverse.¹¹⁵ However, sometimes Gilbert provides, in the *accessus* to the comments on individual psalms, the numbers of previous entries in the same category, so that readers could move backwards through the related group of psalms. In addition, the eye-catching symbols, placed in the margins of the commentary, allow the reader to flip through the psalter and quickly find all the psalms in a category. Still, the impression is that the psalms in each category are meant to be studied in sequence. Perhaps this is indicative of what sort of finding-device this cross-index is meant to be: not an expedient for quick assembling of material for thematic sermons, like the collections of *distinctiones* later in the century,¹¹⁶ but rather a means to study, in some depth, certain specific subjects or questions.

Note that Gilbert's cross-index relies on the assumption that the psalms will be numbered, which does not go without saying: medieval practice was to cite the psalms by incipit, and early psalters are rarely numbered.¹¹⁷ As just one example we might note the *Expositio in Psalmos* attributed, but with serious misgivings, to Bruno the Carthusian.¹¹⁸ Though the author of this commentary will often mention the number of the psalm as he begins to expound it (*Hic titulus huius psalmi tertii*, "The title of this third psalm . . .") he never uses the psalm's number to identify it or to refer the reader to another psalm: for that, he cites the psalm's incipit. If one merely wishes to recollect a certain psalm, this is sufficient: the time-honored "hum a few bars" approach to triggering memory. However, this mnemonic device is unhelpful when what one needs to know is how far back or forward in a manuscript to turn. Gilbert cites numbers frequently

serunt de eadem re secundus et octavus; sequuntur etiam adhuc quinque de eodem": from the comment to Psalm 20 *Domini in virtute* (Paris, B.N. lat 12004, fol. 24v). Gilbert does not always note, as he does here, the other psalms on the same subject.

¹¹⁵ Rouse and Rouse find this to be an "obvious drawback": "*Statim invenire*," 205.

¹¹⁶ See Rouse and Rouse, *ibid.*, 212–216.

¹¹⁷ An exception is Cassiodorus himself, who regularly refers to psalms by number in his *Expositio*. He notes that the Psalter is the only book of Scripture to be so numbered: Praefatio, c. 16 (*CCSL* 97:21).

¹¹⁸ *Expositio in Psalmos*, PL 152: 637–1420. The attribution to Bruno (ob. 1101) is convincingly contested by Damian Van den Eynde, "Complimentary Note on the Early Scholastic *Commentarii in Psalmos*," *Franciscan Studies* 17 (1957): 149–172.

and with assurance, sending the reader off to Psalm 18 or 68 without so much as a *Salvum me fac*.¹¹⁹ Not surprisingly, manuscripts of Gilbert's Psalms commentary are almost without fail provided with numbers, usually in the same hand as the scribe or rubricator. It is possible that the subsequent popularity of Gilbert's Psalms commentary helped to reinforce the concept of citing the rest of the Bible by chapter and verse, a practice which was barely incipient in the first decades of the century, and which, when used widely, would ultimately demand the standardization of such divisions.¹²⁰

The subjects which Gilbert chose to single out for emphasis are in themselves significant and will be scrutinized shortly; what we will note here is that, through the creation of his cross-index, Gilbert has in effect advanced the rather remarkable suggestion that it is advisable to study groups of Psalms out of their natural or narrative order. One of the strongest impediments to the systematization of the study of Scripture was the reluctance to subject the divinely revealed text to dissection; consequently, medieval exegetes were constrained to make their commentary follow the narrative order of their text.¹²¹ This hesitation can be found in the case of other sacred texts as well: in the preface to his collection of 1,173 canonical texts, Deusdedit explains that he supplies a subject index to facilitate its use, because to arrange the material itself by subject would be to violate the integrity of the documents.¹²²

The notion of treating a group of psalms within the Psalter as a conceptual unit was a complete novelty. Although Cassiodorus assigned many psalms to thematic groups, he did so more or less as an

¹¹⁹ Rare, significant exceptions occur when Gilbert's comments embrace a verbatim citation of Augustine, who does not normally refer to the psalms by number.

¹²⁰ Gilbert makes all scriptural references other than the Psalms by verbal citation. However, the need for such standard divisions must have been acutely felt; by mid-century, several conflicting systems were in operation, and once a single system was settled upon towards 1230, there was heaved a collective sigh of relief, and many quickly retrofitted their Bibles with the new numbers: Laura Light, "Versions et révisions du texte biblique," in *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, 85–86. Also Smalley, *Study*, 222–224. Neither mentions Gilbert in this context.

¹²¹ As R. W. Hunt succinctly notes, "the method of developing one's views in a commentary is necessarily unsystematic." "Studies on Priscian," pt. 1, 211.

¹²² Rouse and Rouse, "*Statim invenire*," 204; their discussion emphasises that cardinal Deusdedit was working in something of a methodological vacuum; only recently had the volume of canonical texts reached critical mass, forcing Deusdedit to improvise with his useful but unwieldy subject lists. In general, scholarly apparatus and methodology in both canon and civil law lagged behind developments in theology; Häring, "Commentary and Hermeneutics," 183–184.

afterthought and he does not provide any means, much less encouragement, for the reader to follow through on the idea: the list he provides in the preface is misleading, the scattered notes in the commentary unhelpful and unemphatic.¹²³ Gilbert, on the contrary, singles out particular thematic groupings, spotlights them, and makes provisions for them to be used as such by means of the cross-index symbols.

Gilbert's method of tagging certain psalms so that they can be quickly found and studied together is significant in that it marks a definitive departure from text-dictated methods of exegesis, yet without violating the divinely revealed order of the sacred text. In this sense he declares himself a pioneer among those who were, like him, struggling to find ways to approach the contents of the Bible thematically and systematically. More subtle, and perhaps not conscious on Gilbert's part, is the psychological and cognitive break with the monastic associations of the psalms. The structure of the Psalter was the structure of the monastic life; meditation on verses of the psalms was part of the fabric of the monastic frame of reference and form of expression. Whatever the Psalter meant to Gilbert and his students personally and spiritually, it was also a school text: a focus of "ratiocinative scrutiny" and a source to be consulted for reference purposes, within the confines of a limited period of time.¹²⁴ Whether during the masters' lectures or in a written commentary, working through the psalms line by discrete line was no longer adequate; broader or more complex *quaestiones* kept intruding to obstruct the linear progression through the text.¹²⁵ The understanding provided

¹²³ As O'Donnell rather wistfully notes, *Cassiodorus*, 145.

¹²⁴ Parkes, "*Ordinatio and Compilatio*," 115. Note too G. R. Evans' observation that "... monastic readers did not have to contend with the pressure of an ever growing syllabus of studies." *Old Arts and New Theology; The Beginnings of Theology as an Academic Discipline* (Oxford, 1980), 43.

¹²⁵ The gradual introduction of *quaestiones* into lectures, and thence into commentaries, and their eventual extraction and rearrangement as *sententiae* are discussed (without reference to Gilbert) in Smalley, *Study*, 72-75; G. R. Evans, *The Language and Logic of the Bible*, 126-129. Discussions which include Gilbert in connection with this development (through his commentary on Boethius' *de Trinitate*) are Spicq, *Esquisse*, 67-69, 140; M.-D. Chenu, *Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century*, select., trans. and ed. J. Taylor and L. K. Little (Chicago, 1967), 291-298, esp. 293; Paré, Brunet and Tremblay, *La Renaissance du XII^e siècle*, 125-131. With reference to Gilbert's commentary on the Epistles, which also uses *quaestiones*, M. Simon, "La glose de l'épître aux Romains de Gilbert de la Porrée," 51-80, esp. 73ff.; Vincenzo Miano, "Il commento alle lettere di S. Paolo di Gilberto Porretano," *Scholastica: Ratione historico-critica instauranda* (Rome, 1951), 171-178.

by such exercises had to be fitted into larger but finite, scholarly but practical categories of information. The *lectio divina* of the monastic schools had been and remained primarily a form of organized meditation; *lectio divina* in Gilbert's lecture room was beginning to look like it could lead to systematic theology.

In their discussion of Gilbert's cross-index system, Rouse and Rouse conclude that it was a dead end, an experiment that failed because it was "too eccentric" and "created at the wrong time and place".¹²⁶ It is true that Gilbert himself did not use a cross-index in his later commentaries, instead introducing *quaestiones* into his commentaries on the Epistles and on the theological writings of Boethius. Yet to conclude from this that Gilbert's experiment was a failure is to look at Gilbert's achievement from the wrong end: it *was* "in demand" and *did* inspire "sufficient interest"; otherwise the majority of manuscripts would not have preserved the symbols. To be fair, modern manuscript catalogues almost never indicate whether the symbols are present, so the Rouses could not have known of their ubiquity. It is true that in general, the earlier manuscripts tend to transmit the index symbols with greater accuracy. Scribes (who did not necessarily read what they were copying) often did not understand or care about the odd-looking figures, which in later manuscripts sometimes become unrecognizable. Nevertheless, some manuscripts show that subsequent readers were wont to correct or to provide missing symbols (from other exemplars or from indications in the commentary), proving that they found the index a worthwhile apparatus.¹²⁷ Perhaps the reason why Gilbert's commentary—complete with cross-index symbols—was such a runaway success in its day, and why on the other hand the method was not emulated,¹²⁸ is because the index was created at precisely the "right time and place": the schools of the first decades of the twelfth century, and in particular the school at Laon.

Already by the second decade of the century, Laon was developing an approach to *sacra pagina* which was distinctly non- (if not anti-) monastic.¹²⁹ In that city, with its famous school a magnet for talent

¹²⁶ Rouse and Rouse, "*Statim invenire*," 205.

¹²⁷ See for example MS Rouen Bibl. Mun. 118 (second half of twelfth century). My gratitude to Fabienne Queyroux for information on this manuscript.

¹²⁸ See footnote 5 above. Was the cross-index system developed by Robert Grosseteste ca. 1230 inspired by Gilbert? Hunt, in his study, stresses the fact that Grosseteste rather ignored the great twelfth-century theological works; "Manuscripts containing the indexing symbols of Robert Grosseteste," 186.

¹²⁹ See John Van Engen's *Rupert of Deutz* (Berkeley, 1983) for an evocative

and a “veritable nursery” of canons regular and reformers, and its bishop, Barthélemy of Jur (1113–1151), an active proponent of ecclesiastical as well as monastic reform, it is not surprising to find developing an academic climate at once scholarly and devoted to the formation of a well-prepared clergy.¹³⁰

The school of Anselm at Laon was justly famous for its preeminence in biblical study; not for any particular school of thought, nor even for the sort of textual and literal exegetical scholarship which would become the glory of the school at St. Victor, but rather for the advances made in the actual teaching of the sacred page. Pedagogical method and information management: this is what Laon offered, and how the form of biblical exegesis which was practiced there made an impact on the development on the study of theology. Two ways of “doing theology” are associated with Laon: the *Glossa ordinaria* and the early sentence collections. Laon’s association with the *Glossa*’s origins has recently been given fresh status: Patricia Stirnemann has rounded up the earliest glossed books of the Bible that are clearly “ordinary”, and they hail from Laon.¹³¹ While Gilbert’s position within that circle of glossing activity will be explored fully in subsequent chapters, his connection to the generation of sentence compilers is appropriately considered here.

In the course of explicating a given biblical text line by line, which was the normal procedure for the study of *sacra pagina* at Laon, the master would interrupt himself, or perhaps be interrupted by a student, in order to look more closely at a particular problem raised by

account of the growing tensions between the monastic and “scholastic” approaches to learning.

¹³⁰ Bernard Merlette describes the school of Laon as a “véritable pépinière de chanoines régulier” in reply to Lester K. Little, “Intellectual Training and Attitudes toward Reform, 1075–1150,” in *Pierre Abelard—Pierre le Vénérable*, 252. See also Merlette, “Écoles et bibliothèques à Laon du déclin de l’antiquité au développement de l’Université,” *Actes de 95e Congrès national de sociétés savants* (Paris, 1975): 21–53. Barthélemy, a friend and relative of Bernard of Clairvaux, founded five Premonstratensian and three Cistercian houses near Laon, as well as commanderies of the Knights Templar, and took an active role in supplying local Benedictine houses with reforming abbots, and approved the Carthusian foundation of Val St-Pierre. Barthélemy did not reserve his reforming instincts for monasticism alone, but was a champion of ecclesiastical reform in many guises, fighting simony, encouraging canons regular, and supporting the educational efforts of Anselm and the cathedral school at Laon and of the canons regular of St-Victor near Paris. S. Martinet, *Montlboon* (Laon, 1972), 22–24, 43 (who also refers to Laon as a “pépinière” of reformers).

¹³¹ Patricia Stirnemann, “Où ont été fabriqués les livres de la Glose ordinaire dans la première moitié du XII^e siècle?” *Le XII^e Siècle: Mutations et Renouveau en France dans la première moitié du XII^e Siècle* (Paris, 1994), 257–301.

the text.¹³² These *quaestiones* could take note of conflicting interpretations of a text by various *auctoritates*, but they could also comprise discussions of moral and pastoral issues which the scriptural passages suggested. The results of these investigations were *sententiae*, pronouncements of opinion based on a thorough examination of biblical and patristic sources as well as on the certainty of faith.¹³³ Though Anselm himself was not directly responsible for the organization into collections of the *sententiae* which were determined in his classroom, his disciples would eventually collect and arrange them (along with other magisterial opinions)¹³⁴ for their own use, providing practical handbooks of authoritative judgments on a wide range of topical issues. The questions covered range from simony to schism, from temptation to marital problems to why the soul of unbaptized infants are damned; moral and pastoral considerations share time with doctrinal issues.¹³⁵

The merit of sentence compilations lies in their convenience for both teaching and preaching purposes, because of their searchability and in the opportunity they give for intensive evaluation of a chosen topic. The disadvantage of sentence collections is that they are never really complete, and are notoriously difficult to organize.¹³⁶

¹³² Odon Lottin discusses this type of teaching by Anselm and colleagues in *Psychologie et Morale aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles*, vol. 5, *Problèmes d'histoire littéraire. L'école d'Anselme de Laon et de Guillaume de Champeaux* (Gembloux, 1959), esp. 181, 129.

¹³³ Anselm himself defines what he means by *sententia* in a letter to Heribrand, abbot of St-Laurence in Liège; O. Lottin, *Psychologie et morale* 5:175–176.

¹³⁴ Franz Bliementzrieder retracted his original (1919) view that the collections were by Anselm himself: *Anselms von Laon systematische Sentenzen*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters 18 (Munster, 1919), vol. 1; “Théologie et théologiens de l’école épiscopale de Paris avant Pierre Lombard,” *RTAM* (1931): 289. A dissenting view by René Silvain, who attempts to reconstruct an *urtext* for “the *Sententiae* of Anselm of Laon”: “La tradition des Sentences d’Anselme de Laon,” *AHDLM* 22–23 (1947–48): 1–52.

¹³⁵ See Valerie I. J. Flint, “The ‘School of Laon’: A Reconsideration,” *RTAM* 43 (1976): 89–110, esp. 97ff. Marcia L. Colish, “Systematic Theology and Theological Renewal in the Twelfth Century,” *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 18 (1988) 2:135–156; “Another Look at the School of Laon,” *AHDLM* 53 (1987): 7–22. Also F. Bliementzrieder, “Autour de l’oeuvre théologique d’Anselm de Laon,” *RTAM* 1 (1929): 435–483; “Trente-trois pièces inédites de l’oeuvre théologique d’Anselme de Laon,” *RTAM* 2 (1930): 54–79, esp. 76.

¹³⁶ F. Bliementzrieder observes that “la systématisation . . . n’est pas la caractéristique de ce qu’on appelle les livres des Sentences”: “Autour de l’oeuvre théologique d’Anselme de Laon,” 461. He notes that the compilers were hard put to come up with any logical order at all; modern scholarship is equally challenged to discover what those orders may have been. He suggested that the order was that of the Apostle’s creed; this view is not widely accepted. Other suggestions have included the economy of salvation (Silvain, “La tradition des sentences,” 12), the order of creation (V. I. J. Flint, “School of Laon,” 96) and no order at all, at least for the

They simply cannot cover everything from Creation to last things, although sometimes they give the impression of trying to do so. In contrast, the book of Psalms was inexhaustible. Even Thomas Aquinas was eventually to begin a commentary on the Psalms, recognizing in his prologue that *hic liber generalum habet totius theologiae*.¹³⁷

Inexhaustible it may be, but the theological subjects comprising the Psalter are not in any immediately recognizable or readily retrievable order. Gilbert felt acutely the need for some way to identify and access at least a representative core out of the enormous range of data which the Psalter afforded. At the same time, he was impressed by the immediacy of the topics which were the focus of the Laon school. His preoccupations resulted in a commentary on the Psalms which is not merely an exercise in virtuoso christological allegory, nor a mechanical concatenation of patristic *flores*. The cross-index, which reflects the deeper organization of the commentary, functions as a map designed to chart a way through the vast reserve of wisdom contained in the Psalms while exploring a determined set of pastoral *quaestiones* inspired by the Psalter as a prophecy of Christ. The categories proclaimed in the cross-index provide scope for moral instruction as well as the foundations for future theological speculation. The cross-index, in effect, lets Gilbert combine the advantages of artificial order (like the sentence collections) with the security of working with an integral text.

A brief comparison shows the parallels between Gilbert's subject categories, adapted from Cassiodorus, and the topics of the sentences originating in Laon.¹³⁸ Gilbert's category "on the two natures of Christ" is paralleled in the sentence collections by opinions determining "That two natures constitute one person of Christ (*quod duae naturae constituent unam christi personam*)" and "Whether the body of the Lord has bones and blood (*utrum corpus domini ossa et sanguinem habeat*)". "Christ crying

Laon sentences (Marcia Colish, "Systematic Theology," 143). Peter Lombard appears to have solved the problem in his justly popular *Sentences*: M. Colish, *Peter Lombard* (Leiden, 1994).

¹³⁷ Noted by Van Elswijk in his short article "Gilbert Porreta als glossator van het Psalterium," 286–7. See C. Spicq, *Esquisse*, 313.

¹³⁸ Not all the *magistri* cited in the collections of sentences are disciples of the Laon school; for instance, Ivo of Chartres is represented, as are patristic authorities. I confine myself to *sententiae* attributed to Anselm, Ralph, and William of Champeaux, as they are contained in two manuscripts (Troyes Bibl. Mun. 425 and Avranches Bibl. Mun. 19), extracts of which are published by Bliementzrieder, "Autour de l'oeuvre," 435–483.

out to the Father in the Passion, and the Resurrection" in Cassiodorus is broken down by Gilbert into five longer and six shorter treatments. The sentence collections show entries for questions concerning "the death of Christ (*de morte christi*)."

The seven penitential psalms, fixed by long tradition and duly noted by Cassiodorus, find the practical application of their theme to be the subject of much interest by the *magistri* and their compilers: "on the remission and confession of sin (*de remissione peccatorum, de confessione peccatorum*)". Cassiodorus includes as a subject "the prayers of Christ, chiefly in His human nature" which Gilbert broadens to a more pastorally pertinent "on prayers [by various individuals]"; "*de oratione*" is addressed as well in the *sententiae*. Gilbert finds the inspiration for his category "*de caritate*" in Cassiodorus, and agrees with his colleagues that it ought to be addressed, as it is in the sentences. The high point of the economy of salvation, the Incarnation, is of course granted favored subject status by Cassiodorus; Gilbert echoes this through his category "the First Coming". The sentence compilers also find this relevant to their pastoral concerns, and include items on "the utility of the coming of Christ (*de utilitate adventus christi*)" and "why God became man (*cur deus homo*)". Gilbert's entries on the Church Triumphant and the Church Militant, the perfect and the imperfect Ecclesia, are allegorically represented by the seven "perfect" and "imperfect" alphabetical acrostic psalms. This interpretation of the alphabetic psalms is inspired by Cassiodorus, though Gilbert's treatment gives them a much more ecclesiological turn; similarly, the three psalms of lamentation also reflect a distressed and mourning contemporary Ecclesia. Of course the struggling church on earth is of vital interest to those who lived in it and were making their living in it, and indeed the compilers have collected opinions from their masters on the subjects of "*de scismate*", "*de symonia*", "*de pentecosten*" and even "whether monks ought to relinquish their churches (*utrum debeant monachi relinquere ecclesias suas*)"; the heavenly Church Triumphant is less evident in their pragmatic handbooks.

It is illuminating to look at those categories suggested by Cassiodorus which Gilbert declined to focus on. Neither the psalms beginning with 'Alleluia' nor the gradual psalms receive special treatment in Gilbert's commentary. Similarly, the four psalms in which, according to Cassiodorus, the Lord's future mysteries are revealed through David's deeds (Psalms 7, 26, 33 and 143) do not merit membership in Gilbert's cross-index system. A perusal of the commentary for these

psalms explains why. There is no identifiably pastoral slant, no specific sacramental or ecclesiological concern, to be found in either Gilbert's or his sources' comments on these psalms. Therefore, though they receive due attention, these psalms are not included in Gilbert's proto-systematic cross-index groups. On the other hand, even the (one would think) purely formalist category *attomus* ("without division") receives at Gilbert's hands a strongly pastoral twist, referring to the gift of life and blessings which derive from a house and a Church united by love.

Obviously, the parallels are not exact between Gilbert's categories and those of his colleagues the sentence-collectors: Gilbert does not have a free hand to choose and organize his material, since he has not actually broken with the narrative order of his text.¹³⁹ But I think it is clear that the importance of these categories to Gilbert and his colleagues depends on their application to pastoral concerns, and forms in that sense as much a handbook on pastoral *sententiae* as the sentence collections do. Glossed Psalters were sometimes used as aids in preaching, and Gilbert's index would certainly have been advantageous to the master both in and out of the classroom.¹⁴⁰

Gilbert does energetically follow through, sometimes with heroic effort, the promises implied in his cross-index categories.¹⁴¹ Without question, the resulting commentary looks nothing like *sententiae*, but that is for the same reason stated above: when Gilbert wishes to investigate a topic through the medium of the Psalms text, he is operating under certain constraints. The Laon-influenced sentence compilers evidenced an aversion to allegory quite consistent with their pragmatic program. But as he was dealing with one giant allegory—the Psalms, after all, are prophecy—Gilbert could not allow himself

¹³⁹ Smalley notes this apropos of the anonymous Psalms commentary in MS Laon 17 (probably ca. 1150): "In scope, though not in coherence, this comentary has a certain resemblance to the early twelfth-century sentence books. The difference . . . is merely that the commentator brings forward subjects as they are suggested to him by the text . . . his choice is therefore to some extent limited." "Gilbertus Universalis," 55.

¹⁴⁰ Smalley, "Les commentaires bibliques de l'époque romane," 20, notes that the word '*sermo*' appears in margins of some glosses. Gilbert was known as a great preacher himself; John of Salisbury calls him "excellētissimus gratiae predicator": for this and for preaching by twelfth-century masters see Smalley "L'exégèse biblique," *Entretiens sur la renaissance du douzième siècle* (Paris, 1968), 281; P. Peuchmaurd, "Mission canonique et prédication. Le prêtre ministre de la parole," *RTAM* 30 (1963): 122–144, 251–276; G. R. Evans, *Language and Logic*, 9–10; P. Delhay, "L'origines scolaires au XII^e siècle," *Traditio* 5 (1947): 216. See also Smalley *Study*, 254 for preaching by Stephen Langton.

¹⁴¹ Some examples will be illustrated in chapter 4.

that luxury. He had somehow to tame the allegory, to bridle it with *ratio* and lead it to his students in the form of a docile, useful beast of burden. The means by which Gilbert controls the highly personal, poetic idiom of the Psalmist's prophetic vision are worked out in his Prologue, and will be discussed in the next chapter.

We have already seen, in this chapter, how Gilbert used both his liberal arts background and his study of *sacra pagina* to construct a new approach to reading and teaching the Psalms. From his familiarity with the way the profane authors were taught came Gilbert's useful application of the *cum textu* format and, perhaps, an inclination to subject the revealed text to the categorizing and systematizing methods used to teach profane texts; this includes the willingness to break from the given narrative order and impose an artificial, "searchable" order on it. From Laon, on the other hand, came Gilbert's profound appreciation of Cassiodorus and the strong patristic tradition which informs and gives authority to Gilbert's exposition. Also from Anselm's classrooms came the impetus to look to the Psalms for answers to specific pastoral and theological questions, to treat the Psalter in some way as a kind of prophetic sentence collection, with readily retrievable, indexed topics.

Gilbert's innovations in information management, then, took root in the pedagogic tradition of both profane and sacred science, and bloomed in the atmosphere of ecclesiastical reform which permeated the classrooms of the cathedral schools, including (perhaps especially) Laon. The popularity not only of his commentary, but of the imaginative format in which it was presented, indicates that there was already an appreciative audience for the benefits of artificial or imposed order in the early twelfth century. This search for order, however, had nothing to do with a fascination with rational system as such;¹⁴² instead, it was a purely pragmatic approach to teaching a text which was rich with implication for an audience of future ministers. Biblical exegesis was already struggling toward systematization; in Gilbert's lecture room we are one step closer to the discipline of theology.

¹⁴² The rediscovery of the Aristotelian *logica nova*, with its emphasis on rational system, and the rise of the preaching orders, with their development of the thematic sermon, have been claimed as the most important stimuli to advances in artificial order; both post-date Gilbert. Parkes, "*Ordinatio* and *Compilatio*," 119, 137; Rouse and Rouse, "*Statim invenire*," 218.

CHAPTER THREE

THE ACADEMIC *ACCESSUS* AND THE PSALMS AS LITERATURE

The “handmaidens of theology” had long been importuned to help lift, however discreetly, the veil of language which cloaked the mysteries of Scripture. Grammar and rhetoric, in particular, were routinely appreciated as proven and indispensable aids to the study of the Bible, and Gilbert’s commentary on the Psalms is typical in this regard. But Gilbert’s reliance on the liberal arts went beyond the isolated analysis of a sentence structure here, the recognition of a rhetorical device there: ever mindful that the Psalms were the Word of God, Gilbert was nonetheless aware that they were also the words of men. Without stating the principle in so many words, Gilbert recognized that, sacred or profane, the written word was in some way the domain of the *artes* and subject to analysis as such. Therefore the propaedeutic useful for understanding profane writings must necessarily be applicable to sacred texts as well.¹ To this end Gilbert appropriated a teaching tool from the liberal arts, the academic *accessus*, and exploited it for the teaching of Scripture. Gilbert’s use of the academic *accessus* in his Psalms commentary characterizes his exegetical approach in two ways: it exemplifies the focus and internal cohesion of his commentary by providing an organizing principle from which to work; and it reflects his approach to theology as a school discipline by integrating it methodologically with the liberal arts.

Accessus, meaning a “means of approach”, was one of several terms (one also finds *didascalica*, *periochae* or *circumstantiae* as well as simply *prologus*, *introductio* and the like) used to designate various types of structured academic prologues, variable in form and adaptable to circumstance. An *accessus* of some form or other was widely used, from Late Antiquity, to introduce to students the writings of the

¹ In their anthology of medieval commentaries, A. J. Minnis and A. B. Scott agree: “In the twelfth century, certain scholars—notably Peter Abelard and Gilbert of Poitiers—had in their Bible commentaries applied to sacred literature the conventions and categories of secular literary theory and criticism.” *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism c.1100–c.1375*, rev. ed. (Oxford, 1991), 6–7.

classical authors. Normally, an *accessus*-prologue provided students with a brief historical or biographical background of the author and his work. In addition, it would prepare the student to appreciate the style and organization of the work, and it would remind the student what he was expected to gain by reading it. At their best, these informational prologues encouraged the students to consider the work before them as an integral unit, to take, as it were, a macroscopic view of it before they proceeded to analyze it microscopically, in the line-by-line tradition of *lectio* and glossing.

Based on three main types of academic prologues developed in Late Antiquity, the various medieval versions were considered nearly indispensable to the teaching of the liberal arts. Eventually their proven usefulness prompted *accessus*-prologues to be devised for subjects outside the scope of the liberal arts: commentaries in the fields of law, medicine, and theology slowly incorporated academic *accessus* forms into their prologues. A brief look at the historical development of the *accessus* will provide the background necessary to understand Gilbert's particular contribution in this area.

The *locus classicus* for the history of the *accessus* is Edwin Quain's 1945 article in *Traditio*, to which have been added major contributions by R. W. Hunt, R. B. C. Huygens and most recently A. J. Minnis, who includes the most thorough and insightful discussions of Gilbert's Prologue to date.² Quain's point of departure was the recognition that historians of many disciplines—from rhetoric to philosophy to civil and canon law—had noted the use of types of *accessus* in their own fields, yet ignored the existence of the practice in other fields. Quain's article broadened the horizons, making it clear that the use of the *accessus* did not develop independently in various disciplines, but rather that there was a long and fruitful

² Edwin A. Quain, "The Medieval *Accessus ad auctores*," *Traditio* 3 (1945): 215–264; R. B. C. Huygens, "Notes sur le *Dialogus super Auctores* de Conrad de Hirsau et le *Commentaire sur Théodule* de Bernard d'Utrecht," *Latomus* 13 (1954): 420–428; ed., *Conrad de Hirsau, Dialogus super auctores*, Collection Latomus 17 (Brussels, 1955); R. W. Hunt, "The Introductions to the 'Artes' in the Twelfth Century," *Studia medievalia in honorem . . . Raymundi Josephi Martin* (Bruges, 1948), 85–112; A. J. Minnis, *Medieval Theories of Authorship*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia, 1984), esp. 9–72; "Discussions of 'Authorial Role' and 'Literary form' in Late-Medieval Scriptural Exegesis," *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Litteratur* 99 (1977): 37–65; "Literary Theory in Discussions of *Formae tractandi* by Medieval Theologians," *New Literary History* 11 (1979): 133–145; Minnis and Scott, see n. 1 above. The first extensive modern discussion of the *accessus ad auctores* is G. Przychocki, "Accessus Ovidiani," *Rosprawy Akademii Umiejetnosci Wydział Filologiczny* [Dissertations of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Philological Section] Series 3, (Krakow, 1911), 65–126.

cross-pollination of *accessus* types between different areas of study.³ Quain traced the formulae for the various types back to the Late Antique commentators on Aristotle; by the sixth century, he observes, one is dealing with a “rigidly prescribed program, a traditional formula obligatory on all philosophical commentators”.⁴ The philosophy-specific form of *accessus* found its characteristic expression in Boethius’ introduction to his commentary on Porphyry’s *Isagoge*. We will look again in more detail at this influential *accessus* and its relation to Gilbert’s Prologue; for the moment, here in their fullest form are the *accessus* headings which Boethius called *didascalica*:⁵ the intention of the work (*operis intentio*), its usefulness (*utilitas*), its order (*ordo*), its authenticity (*si eius cuius esse opus dicitur, germanus propriusque liber est*), its “inscription” or title (*operis inscriptio*), and finally to which “part of philosophy”, i.e. branch of knowledge, the work belonged (*ad quam partem philosophiae cuiuscumque libri ducatur intentio*). This philosophical or “type C” prologue, as it was designated by Hunt, shows significant variation; Boethius himself uses shorter versions (two to four entries) of it in his later commentaries.⁶

In the meantime, other disciplines in the *artes* developed various forms of *accessus*-prologues as an aid to teaching. The Late Antique rhetoricians and grammarians were partial to the traditional *circumstantiae* to provide the framework for their introductions to the classical texts which they studied.⁷ Their Carolingian commentators, in turn, adapted (and usually shortened) the “who, what, where, by what means, why, how, and when” to focus primarily on *persona*, *locus* and *tempus*, occasionally adding *causa*.⁸ Academic prologues which fall within this scheme are designated “type A” *accessus* by Hunt.

³ Quain, “*Accessus*,” 216.

⁴ Quain, *ibid.*, 247, 262–263.

⁵ Boethius, *In Isagogen Porphyrii Commenta*, ed. S. Brandt, *CSEL* 48:4–5. Quain provides the relevant Boethian text (including his Greek equivalents of the six entries) in “*Accessus*,” 236.

⁶ Hunt, “Introduction to the *Artes*,” 94, 95.

⁷ The traditional rhetorical circumstances, as mandated by the grammarian Priscian (fl. A.D. 500), are: *quis*, *quid*, *ubi*, *quibus auxiliis*, *cur*, *quomodo*, *quando*; they also turn up, respectively, as *persona*, *res*, *locus*, *facultas* or *materia*, *causa*, *qualitas* or *modus*, and *tempus*; see Quain, “*Accessus*,” 256; and Hunt, “Introduction to the *Artes*,” 94n. Further variants, including one sanctioned by Alcuin, are given in C. E. Lutz, “One Formula of *Accessus* in Remigius’ Works,” *Latomus* 19 (1960): 777n. Alcuin’s formula runs: *persona*, *factus*, *tempus*, *locus*, *modus*, *occasio*, *facultas*.

⁸ Hunt, “Introduction to the *Artes*,” 94; Minnis, *Authorship*, 16; H. Silvestre, “Le schéma ‘moderne’ des *accessus*,” *Latomus* 16 (1957): 684–689.

But the Carolingian commentators on secular *auctores*, especially those who tackled Vergil, also began to introduce their studies with variations on a different *accessus* form—one devised by Servius (fl. A.D. 400) for his own popular commentary on Vergil's *Aeneid*.⁹ Servius' scheme, like Boethius', derives ultimately from Late Antique commentaries on philosophy,¹⁰ but had been pragmatically adapted to the special requirements of poetry and rhetoric. His *accessus* includes the following items (to be discussed in detail shortly)¹¹: the life of the poet (*poetae vita*), title (*titulus operis*), the quality or type of song (*qualitas carminis*), the reason why it was written (*scribentis intentio*), the number of 'books' and the order in which they were written (*numerus* and *ordo librorum*) and finally the *explanatio*. An anonymous ninth-century commentator begins his *Vita Vergiliana* with what he calls the "seven circumstances", but what follows is not the old rhetorical *circumstantiae*; rather, they are entries based on Servius: *vita*, *titulus*, *qualitas*, *intentio*, *numerus*, *ordo*, *explanatio*.¹² Similarly, when Sedulius' early ninth-century *Paschale Carmen* received its commentary, it was introduced with the Servian scheme; "because Sedulius was regarded as a Christian Vergil", suggest Minnis and Scott, but surely because this "type B" *accessus* was simply particularly well-suited to literary endeavors.¹³

By the late eleventh century, the seven rhetorical circumstances and the Carolingian three- or four-fold versions thereof were declared outmoded, and "modern" schema comprising elements from both

⁹ For commentaries in the fields of grammar and rhetoric, see Ralph J. Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling: Studies in medieval school commentaries on Ovid's 'Ars Amatoria', 'Epistolae ex Ponto', and 'Epistolae Heroidum'*, Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung 38 (Munich, 1986); John O. Ward, "From Antiquity to the Renaissance: Glosses and Commentaries on Cicero's *Rhetorica*," *Medieval Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Medieval Rhetoric* ed. James J. Murphy (Berkeley, 1978), 25–67.

¹⁰ Quain, "Accessus," 263.

¹¹ *Servianorum in Vergilii carmina commentariorum*, Harvard ed. 2 (Cambridge, Mass., 1946) 1–5; Quain, "Accessus," 226, gives the elements of Servius' *accessus*; an excerpted translation is provided by Minnis, *Authorship*, 15.

¹² *Vita Vergiliana* ed. J. Brummer (Leipzig, 1912); cited in Silvestre, "Schéma 'moderne'," 684–685.

¹³ Minnis and Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory*, 12. A late Carolingian commentary on Sedulius' *Carmen* (by Remigius of Auxerre?) introduces it with the traditional seven rhetorical circumstances, then redefines them as "*tempus*, *locus*, *persona*, *res causa*, *qualitas*, *facultas*"; this is evidently a hybrid "type A/B" *accessus*; Silvestre, "Schéma 'moderne'," 685–686.

Servius and Boethius began to dominate the liberal arts scene. An example of this is the interpolated eleventh-century *accessus* which follows the original tripartite type A prologue to a Carolingian commentary on Cato's *Distichs*:¹⁴ "In the beginning of every book, according to our predecessors, seven things were to be mentioned first: [he lists the seven rhetorical circumstances] . . . But just three are required according to the fashion of the moderns: the life of the poet, the title of the work and which part of philosophy it regards." Though the "title" is included in both the Boethian and Servian model, the "life of the poet" is drawn from the latter while the "part of philosophy" is inspired by the former. Similarly, Bernard of Utrecht, writing in the last quarter of the eleventh century, calls both the type B Servian and the type A rhetorical models "antique", and says the "moderns" use only matter (*operis materia*), intention (*scribentis intentio*), part of philosophy (*ad quam philosophiae tendat partem*), and quality (*qualitas*). The final entry, according to Bernard, is added on the authority of Boethius "who says in the *Topics* 'ut comparetur copia argumentorum et clara possit esse distinctio locorum'".¹⁵ Be that as it may, *qualitas* was, as we have seen, a standard item in the type B Servian *accessus* formula since the fifth century, without Boethius' sanction. *Qualitas* also occurs, along with *modus*, as a variant heading within the type A rhetorical model, replacing the *quomodo* suggested by Priscian.¹⁶ Clearly the *accessus* was a permeable creation. A curious hybrid containing elements from all three types of academic prologues demonstrates the futility of trying to classify all of these *accessūs* as one type or another. This is from an anonymous, eleventh-century commentary on portions of the *Psychomachia* of Prudentius: "Seven things are to be considered in the beginning of each book: *persona, locus, tempus, scribentis intentio, titulus libri, qualitas carminis, cui parte philosophiae subiaceat*."¹⁷ The first three items are right out of the

¹⁴ Commentary on *Disticha Catonis*, MS Lucca Bibl. pubb. 1433 (11th century) ed. A. Mancini, "Un commento ignoto di Remy d'Auxerre," *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, 11 (1902): 179; cited in Silvestre, "Schéma 'moderne'," 686: "In exordio uniuscuiusque libri septem apud antecessores nostros praelibanda erant: quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando . . . Sed modo apud modernos tantummodo tria requirentur: vita poetae, titulus operis et ad quam partem philosophiae spectet."

¹⁵ The entire passage is provided by Huygens, "Notes sur le *Dialogus*," 423-424.

¹⁶ See note 7 above.

¹⁷ MS Brussels 10066-77, fol. 85v-86; unedited. Cited in Silvestre, "Schéma 'moderne'," 687.

Carolingian type A, the next three are taken from Servius, and the final entry is pure Boethius.¹⁸

At about the same time, legal glossators in the school of Bologna set about selecting and adapting the entries of the philosophical *accessus* to allow themselves scope for raising theoretical issues, while the Pavian glossators used it as a means to re-order their chronologically-organized text. Hermann Kantorowicz notes variants of the philosophical *accessus* (the jurists' term for it is *materia*) among all the seminal works: those of Irenaeus, his student Rogerius, Bulgarus, Placentius, Bassianus and Azo, and in the *Summa Trecensis* and the *Summa Londiniensis*. Quain notes that the canonists were not far behind, though the earliest canonical *accessus* he mentions is the *materia* of Paucapalea, around 1140–1148.¹⁹ Quain theorizes that the jurists got their *accessus* format through the intermediary of the grammarians and the rhetoricians, but it is noteworthy that Burchard of Worms cites Boethius' scheme nearly verbatim in a letter to one Alpert (*ca.* 1022–1025).²⁰ However, Burchard does not use Boethius' (or in fact any) *accessus* to introduce his own *Decretum*, so a direct link between Boethius and the canon law commentators is still a matter for speculation. The frequent use by the jurists of the term *materia* does support Quain's hypothesis, since it turns up often in type A-related prologues²¹ but does not appear in Boethius. Nonetheless, it is interesting that Burchard is familiar with the Boethian scheme; this reinforces our concept of the interdependence of the disciplines, or at least of the personnel who studied and taught the disciplines, in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries.

It is hardly astonishing that various elements from both B and C prologue types should keep resurfacing in commentaries on the liberal arts, philosophy and law. Boethius' commentary on Porphyry

¹⁸ Minnis maintains the viability of the types themselves, while stressing that a "type C" prologue can be "modified" by the introduction of headings from other prologue types: *Authorship*, 19; (with Scott) *Medieval Literary Theory*, 13–14. Which "type" would this be? Perhaps it is less misleading to think of these as hybrids, drawing freely on the whole *accessus* tradition as needed.

¹⁹ Hermann Kantorowicz, *Studies in the Glossators of Roman Law* (Cambridge, 1938), 38. Quain, "Accessus," 240; Paucapalea's *materia* includes only three entries, namely *materia*, *intentio*, and *modus tractandi*. For the *accessus* to the *Liber Papiensis*, see Charles Radding, *World Made by Men* (Chapel Hill, 1985), 179–186; *Liber Papiensis*, ed. A. Boretius, *MGH SS* (1875) 4:290.

²⁰ Quain, "Accessus," 242, where he gives the text of Burchard's letter.

²¹ See note 7 above; in listings of the rhetorical circumstances, the terms *materia* or *facultas* often designates subject matter.

and Servius' on Vergil were notable among works which enjoyed a renewed popularity during the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, that is to say during Gilbert's own formative years, as part of a general increase in demand for textbooks.²² Consequently, when masters crafted *accessus* for their glosses, they were able to draw directly on Late Antique sources as well as on current variants, customizing their prologues to suit the needs of their text and their students.

By the beginning of the twelfth century, variations on the *accessus* had been adapted for all of the branches of the liberal arts as well as for law and medicine.²³ Conspicuous by its absence is any trace of even abbreviated versions of these "modern" *accessus* to introduce Scriptural commentary. The old-fashioned rhetorical *circumstantiae* had, it is true, turned up in the abbreviated *persona, locus, tempus* form in the commentaries of Gregory the Great on Ezechiel, and of Bede on the Apocalypse. This brief schema then appears sporadically throughout the Carolingian era, as in the Matthew commentary of Christian of Stavelot;²⁴ the genuine Scriptural works of Remigius of Auxerre, on the other hand, bear no academic prologues at all, though his commentaries on profane authors do.²⁵ The old three-fold form is even used as late as the first quarter of the twelfth century by Hugh of St. Victor for his biblical commentaries, though by then it was

²² G. R. Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology: The Beginnings of Theology as an Academic Discipline* (Oxford, 1980), 21.

²³ See G. R. Evans, "The Influence of Quadrivium Studies in the eleventh- and twelfth-century schools," *Journal of Medieval History* 1 (1975): 151–164. The use of the *accessus* for works on canon law lagged, but that is readily explained: since the canon received constant additions, there was never a comprehensive, codified body which would lend itself to glossing activity; thus, no *accessus*. Gratian's *Decretum*, ca. 1142, soon attracted a body of glosses and an *accessus*. See Kantorowicz's contribution to B. Smalley's *Study*, 55; Malcolm B. Parkes, "The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book," *Medieval Learning and Literature* (Oxford, 1976), 119. Hunt "Introductions to the *Artes*," 96n, provides references for examples in medical commentaries.

²⁴ Gregory the Great, *PL* 76:795; Bede, *PL* 93:195; noted in Minnis, *Authorship*, 17. Christian of Stavelot, *Expositio in Mattheum*, *PL* 106:1264; noted in Silvestre, "Schéma 'moderne'," 684.

²⁵ See for example *Remigii Autissiodorensis commentum in Martianum Capellam*, ed. C. Lutz (Leiden, 1962); *Remigii Autissiodorensis in artem Donati minorem commentum*, ed. W. Fox, (Leipzig, 1892); also see C. Lutz, "One Formula of *Accessus* in Remigius' Works," *Latomus* 19 (1960): 774–780. Remigius' commentaries on the Pauline Epistles in *PL* 207; on Minor Prophets, Song of Songs and Apocalypse, *PL* 117; on Psalms, see P. A. Vaccari, "Il genuino commento ai Salmi di Remigio di Auxerre," *Biblica* 26 (1945): 52–99, including edition of Prologue (non-*accessus*), 66–68.

quite *passé* as a teaching tool. But the “modern” *accessus* with its philosophical and literary associations, which had become a standard feature of liberal arts pedagogy, appears to have been ignored or avoided by commentators of Scripture at the beginning of the twelfth century. Alleged sightings of B and C type academic prologues prior to this time invariably turn out to be false alarms; Psalms commentaries with these “modern” *accessus* have been attributed to Remigius of Auxerre (fl. 900) and Haimo of Halberstadt (ob. 853), but these attributions are no longer accepted.²⁶ The prologue (including *materia, intentio, modus tractandi*) which is affixed to the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms as it appears in the *Patrologia Latina*, volume 113 does not appear in early manuscripts (such as Paris B.N. lat. 105 and 442) and is certainly a later accretion.

By mid-century, on the other hand, one is hard-pressed to find a Scriptural commentary written in an academic milieu which is *not* prefaced by a some variation or recombination of the type B or C *accessus*; even some monastic writers found the new prologue forms attractive. Among Psalms commentators alone the practice had become endemic. Gerhoch of Reichersberg applied four of the entries to his Psalms commentary; Honorius Augustodunensis itemized six points in his own commentary; whoever really wrote the commentary attributed to Haimo of Halberstadt used a five-fold version, as did Peter Lombard.²⁷ In no time, the “modern” *accessus* in various shapes and guises was a commonplace of biblical exegesis, as it had long been of secular literature. Abelard, who had used an abbreviated version of Boethius’ philosophical *accessus* for his own commentary on Porphyry’s *Isagoge*, later employed *intentio, materia, and modus tractandi* in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. But far from being the originator, or even the popularizer, of the *accessus* for

²⁶ Ps-Remigius of Auxerre, *PL* 131; Ps-Haimo of Halberstadt, *PL* 116; see chapter four for the question of dating these and other problematic commentaries.

²⁷ Gerhoch of Reichersberg uses *materia, intentio, modus tractandi* and *titulus libri*; *Commentarius in Psalmos*, *PL* 193; Honorius Augustodunensis employs title, intention, subject matter, author, utility and final cause; *Expositio Psalmorum* (selections), *PL* 172; Pseudo-Haimo addresses *ordo, materia, modus, intentio* and *titulus*, *PL* 116; Peter Lombard, *In totum psalterium commentarii*, *PL* 191. The identity of the mysterious Honorius is still less than certain, though he is probably “of Regensburg”. His commentary, dated anywhere from 1115 to shortly after mid-century, seems to have been little circulated: only six twelfth-century manuscripts exist; V. I. J. Flint, “Some Notes on the Early Twelfth Century Commentaries on the Psalms”, *RTAM* 38 (1971): 88n. See chapter four.

scriptural exegesis, as was once claimed,²⁸ Abelard is seen now as one participant in a rapidly spreading movement. As to the question of popularizing the method, both Abelard and Gilbert were acclaimed teachers who attracted large numbers of students, so their use of the *accessus* in lectures on Scripture would have reached a wide audience; yet an audience vaster still was reached by the many manuscripts of Gilbert's commentary which swept Europe, inspiring new commentaries by monks and scholars alike, from Gerhoch of Reichersberg to Peter Lombard. In contrast, Abelard's works tend to exist in unique copies or by mere handfuls.²⁹

But the point should not be obscured by quibbling about 'firsts'. The fact remains that in the first decades of the century there began a concerted effort to identify the place of Scriptural studies in the secular schools, and Peter Abelard was no less a part of that movement than was Gilbert.³⁰ What we wish to stress here is that Gilbert effects a radical transfer of liberal arts technique to the problem of organizing a commentary on the sacred poetry of the Psalter. Gilbert's use of the academic *accessus* is not merely a facade, affixed to the commentary to make it look more "scientific", a practice much in evidence in the mid-twelfth century.³¹ Rather, it is intrinsic to the organization of his commentary, setting the tone and the methodology to be followed throughout each of the 150 Psalms. As such it is

²⁸ "The *accessus ad auctorem* found in many biblical commentaries of the twelfth century seems to have originated in Abelard's philosophical writings . . . Later Abelard transferred this schema to his biblical commentaries." Nikolaus M. Häring, "Commentary and Hermeneutics," in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), 185–186. Also see Häring, "The Lectures of Thierry of Chartres on Boethius' *De trinitate*", *AHDLM* 24 (1959): 117. Abelard's Commentary on Romans is ca. 1135. Minnis correctly notes that Abelard was not the innovator of the practice; *Authorship*, 235n.

²⁹ See Nikolaus M. Häring, "Abelard Yesterday and Today," in *Pierre Abélard—Pierre le Vénérable*, 341–403.

³⁰ Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology*, esp. 31, 44, 63, 120–125.

³¹ Hexter notes that this sometimes occurred even in liberal arts commentaries; in some cases, an *accessus* was affixed to make existing commentaries appear more "modern", but was obviously not an organizing factor in the writing of the commentary itself. Only *intentio* seemed to find a relatively steady place in the hearts and the commentaries of the commentators; *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, 8, 212. Among early twelfth-century scriptural commentaries, a cursory type C/B *accessus* often comprises the final paragraph of a prologue, looking very much like an afterthought: compare the Psalms commentary prologue of Letbert of Lille (PL 21, under the name of "Rufinus") or that printed with the *Glossa ordinaria* (PL 113) with the carefully constructed *accessus*-prologue of Honorius (PL 172). For Letbert's prologue, see chapter four.

indicative of his attempt to find a methodology suitable for incorporating this sacred book into the school curriculum, to render the study of Scripture manageable in the compass of a classroom.³²

It is illuminating that Gilbert turned to the modern *accessus* for profane literature when constructing his prologue, for he surely did not lack for models of prologues among sacred commentaries. The prefaces written by Hilary of Poitiers and Cassiodorus are thoughtful, thorough, and elegantly written; but they are also leisurely and prolix. The letters of Jerome to Paula and Eustochius and to Damasus, along with relevant excerpts from his other writings, were featured as prologue material in many glosses on the Psalter; but they were not, in themselves, sufficiently complete as propaedeutic tools. The prologues which introduced the Carolingian commentaries were generally pastiches of useful material mined from Patristic sources, but were by nature ill-organized and often repetitious, since blocks of borrowed insights tended to overlap.³³ Certainly Gilbert owes a great debt to his predecessors. As the references in the margins of the manuscripts indicate, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, Hilary, Cassiodorus, and Remigius are all laid under contribution for the material included in Gilbert's Prologue. But none of the time-honored models before him provided Gilbert with a structure which would allow him to convey maximum information in a minimum of time and space. To supply a new paradigm for prologues to scriptural studies in the classroom, Gilbert turned to the proven efficiency of the *accessus*-prologues of his liberal arts education. Out of the richness of technical information, explanations, observations and leitmotifs to be found in the patristic and Carolingian commentators, Gilbert chooses and arranges what he wants around the framework of his *accessus*. The result is a succinct, tightly organized prologue whose clearly enunciated themes animate the body of the commentary with a rare sense of purpose.

In borrowing the *accessus* from other disciplines, Gilbert paid close attention to the appropriateness of the application. He was, as John of Salisbury reports, famous for being both well aware of the interconnection between disciplines, and meticulous about maintaining the

³² Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology*, 28.

³³ See S. Berger, "Les préfaces jointes aux livres de la Bible dans les manuscrits de la Vulgate," *Mémoires présentés à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* vol. 11 (Paris, 1904), 40-46.

boundaries between them.³⁴ This is evident in the care Gilbert took in adapting the tradition of the liberal arts *accessus* to the needs of scriptural exegesis. Not content to squeeze his questions and observations concerning the Psalter into either philosophical or literary categories, Gilbert studied the available types, and from them constructed his own academic prologue, an *accessus* to sacred rather than profane writings. In this fashion he eludes the pitfalls of trying to explain things such as “to what part of philosophy” the Psalter belongs, while establishing a certain scholarly mindset, a sense of academic rigor. Professors Minnis and Scott suggest that the *accessus* “enhanced the prestige of secular literature” by bringing it “within the standard frameworks of knowledge as defined in the twelfth century,” establishing, as it were, its serious credentials.³⁵ How much greater an impact it must have made to hear the Book of Psalms subjected to the same regimen of questions as Vergil or Porphyry! This is not merely Scripture taught in schoolroom, it is Scripture taught as a scholarly discipline.

A chart of the two classic models of academic *accessus*, the Servian and the Boethian, plus the paradigm of the “modern” twelfth-century liberal arts *accessus*, will facilitate this discussion:³⁶

BOETHIUS (type C)	SERVIUS (type B)	‘MODERN’ ³⁷
intentio	vita poetae	titulus
utilitas	titulus operis	materia
ordo	qualitas carminis	intentio
authenticity	scribentis intentio	modus
inscriptio	numerus librorum	utilitas
pars philosophiae	ordo librorum	pars philosophiae
	explanatio	

³⁴ John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, c.12, ed. and tr. M. Chibnall as *Memoires of the Papal Court* (London, 1956): “et cohibebat omnium regulas infra proprii generis limitem.” See also van Elswijk, *Gilbert Porreta*, 37–39; Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology*, 47–51; M.-D. Chenu, “Un essai de méthode théologique au XII^e siècle,” *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 24 (1935): 258–267.

³⁵ Minnis and Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory*, 13.

³⁶ The Latin terms are retained throughout this discussion the better to enable us to see influences from the various models. However, as noted above, Boethius translates the Greek *gnesion* as “si eius cuius esse opus dicitur germanus propriusque liber est”; I take the liberty of substituting “authenticity”.

³⁷ The liberal arts *accessus* as it is given by Bernard of Utrecht (see above) is accepted by Minnis and Scott as the ‘modern’ paradigm, and is labelled ‘type C’ as

A few remarks on this wealth of propaedeutic inquiry may be in order. "Title" or "inscription" appears in all three models, and is self-explanatory. A consideration of the "intention" of the work in all three types is coupled in two of them with the work's "usefulness". For Boethius and the "modern" *accessus*, the intention of the work is determined objectively, by its subject matter (*i.e.* the intention of the work is to discuss a certain philosophical topic) while its utility is essentially where the work fits into a Christian curriculum. The "modern" *accessus* borrows the heading *materia* from the Carolingian rhetorical model to facilitate discussion of the subject matter, authorial intention and utility.³⁸ Servius subsumes all three queries under his heading "intention" and gets somewhat closer to what we would think of as the intention of the author—that is, a subjective consideration of what the author hoped to accomplish by writing the work and what he hoped to gain by it. In practice, the Servian *intentio* provided for some interesting developments, since commentators were not slow to take note of multiple intentions on the part of ancient authors, usually a more general purpose (such as praising love or praising Caesar) and a more practical, immediate goal (such as seducing a girl or avoiding exile).

The entry *ordo* is also complex. In the philosophical *accessus*, this includes both the place the work holds within its discipline, and the order or steps by which the work proceeds; the "modern" type usually renders this *modus*. Order in the Servian model is approached in a more formalistic way, in the "number" and "order of the books". The author's mode of proceeding, then, is reflected in his artistic expression, in the poetic form of his writing.

Of practical importance to students of Aristotle is the heading *pars philosophiae*. The commentator of a philosophical work had to take a stand among the various opinions concerning the place of logic, ethics and philosophy before he could proceed to analyze his text. The Late Antique grammarians felt no need for this heading, so on the authority of Servius they substituted *qualitas carminis*, the type of poetry employed by the author to convey his intention. Despite this useful innovation, the "modern" liberal arts *accessus* continued

the inheritor of that mantle from Boethius. It is not invariable, nor is it based solely on the Boethian model, as they may inadvertently suggest, *Medieval Literary Theory*, 13–14.

³⁸ Hunt, "Introduction to the *Artes*," 95–96; Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, 46–47.

mechanically to use the heading *pars philosophiae*, and almost invariably included the work in question under the rubric of “ethics”. This is because ethics dealt with moral philosophy, and high moral purpose was routinely attributed to even the most incorrigibly scandalous ancient authors.³⁹ Of course this had to be reflected in the *intentio* of the author, and considering the content of many of the classics, it took some serious application to provide a suitable moral purpose for their authors.

Neither questions of authenticity nor considerations of the author’s life made their way into the “modern” *accessus*, perhaps to the detriment of medieval literary theory.⁴⁰ The “life of the poet” in the Servian model had allowed some scope for the consideration of the human aspect of authorship, and also had encouraged at least a superficial investigation into the historical background of the work and a concomitant literality of interpretation (as in the recognition of the more immediate and concrete goals of the author).

In constructing his own *accessus*, Gilbert does not take over any of his models indiscriminately.⁴¹ It is as interesting to see what Gilbert chose to alter and omit as to see what he included. A chart of the items from Gilbert’s *accessus*-prologue will make it easier to compare it to the three models discussed above:⁴²

³⁹ B. Bischoff finds this moralizing to be “ridiculous” and “incredible”; he concedes that in casting medieval notions into the minds of the classical authors, the commentators “helped people to observe everyday life”: “Living with the Satirists,” *Classical Influences on European Culture AD 500–500*, ed. R. R. Bolgar, (Cambridge, 1971), 90, 92–93. Many do not share Bischoff’s condescension: Quain, for example, applauds the “independence of mind and command over his material” which the moralizer evidences, adding that “the medieval teacher would doubtless be amused at our suspicions of his intelligence”; “*Accessus*,” 222, 226. P. Delhaye too finds the thought of Ovid as ethics to be only mildly surprising and a bit “optimistic”: “*Grammatica et ethica* au XII^e siècle,” *RTAM* 25 (1958): 59–110 (reprinted in *Enseignement et morale au XII^e siècle*, (Fribourg, 1988).

⁴⁰ Minnis suggests that this lapse kept scholars of the high middle ages from treating the author as a human being sharing human experiences with his readers through his poetic art, and left them concentrating on “authority”; *Authorship*, esp. 20–21, 47. He compares this with strides made in the later middle ages, for example pp. 109–111.

⁴¹ Hunt (and therefore everyone else) lists the Prologue to Gilbert’s Psalms commentary as a type C *accessus*, without exploring the reasons for or the ramifications of the obvious discrepancies; “Introduction to the *Artes*,” 96.

⁴² All citations are from Gilbert’s Prologue unless otherwise indicated. I cite MS Paris Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 12004; it is reliable and easy to read. Compare the edition of the Prologue given in Maria Fontana, “Il commento ai Salmi di Gilberto della Porrée,” *Logos* 13 (1930): 283–301. The first paragraph she gives is not part of Gilbert’s Prologue, which begins “Christus integer . . .”.

materia	(subject matter)
modus	(method of proceeding)
intentio	(purpose of the work)
titulus libri	(title of the book)
genus prophetiae	(type of prophecy)
nominus libri	(name of the book)
numerus psalorum	(number of the psalms)
ordo	(order)

First of all, Gilbert appropriates the heading *materia* from the “modern” *accessus*. It is an astute choice, since it provides him with a powerful organizational concept which governs every other entry in his *accessus* and every exegetical choice which Gilbert will make throughout the entire commentary. Gilbert loses no time in identifying the subject of the Psalter: “*Christus integer caput cum membris est materia huius libri* (the whole Christ, head and members, is the subject of this book)”. This is as uncompromising a statement of hermeneutical intent as can be wished, and in fact it forms an unrelenting leitmotif throughout the duration of the commentary. Indeed, it is the Body of Christ which supplies the exegetical heart and soul of Gilbert’s commentary.

The theme itself, of course, is hardly new. Origen had spelled out the principle that Christ was the central figure of both the New and the Old Testament, and that all persons and events were to be interpreted ‘literally’ as prefigurings or types of Christ.⁴³ Origen himself was only providing a technical expression of a theme already current among early Christian apologists; certainly St. Paul operates on this assumption, the Acts of the Apostles rings with it, and Christ is frequently reported as quoting Scripture (especially the Psalms) in reference to Himself. Even more influential here is Augustine, who continually recalled the theme of the unity of the Psalter and the unity of the “head” and “members” in one Body. Cassiodorus further elaborated Augustine’s idea, and from there it passed into the basic medieval exegetical vocabulary for the Psalter.⁴⁴ Gilbert accepts the

⁴³ Smalley, *Study*, 6–7. Also, J. Daniélou, *Origène* (Paris, 1948); H. de Lubac, *Histoire et esprit: l’intelligence de l’Écriture d’après Origène* (Paris, 1950).

⁴⁴ In his edition of Cassiodorus’ *Expositio* (CCSL 97–98; see 97:v–vii), M. Adriaen collected references to this commentary in medieval glosses. While the list is sketchy, it suggests that Cassiodorus enjoyed his highest popularity in the ninth century; the twelfth is represented only by Abelard and Gratian(!). J. J. O’Donnell, too, comes

prevailing christological interpretation of the Psalms, but his language is more emphatic than usual. He notes that while other books of Scripture (he does not specify only the Old Testament) also speak of Christ, they do so “briefly, diffusely and obscurely (*pauca, diffuse et obscure*)”; the Psalter, in contrast, “prophesied richly, concisely and openly (*plura, breviter et aperte prophetavit*)”. Like all the notions in his Prologue, this one is carried throughout the exposition of the Psalter; for example at Psalm 21, where Gilbert avers “This narration, however, is not covered with figures, like a prophecy, but is manifest. as in the Gospel.”⁴⁵

Gilbert’s description of *Christus integer* goes deliberately beyond the general understanding of the Psalms as Messianic, however. The Body of Christ which so informs Gilbert’s commentary is only rarely the *corpus et sanguis Domini*. Rather, for Gilbert, the Body of Christ is usually Ecclesia, which comprises not only the organized Church but also the body of the faithful and the “body” of the Psalter itself. Gilbert’s emphasis on the Church, broadly construed, as the Body of Christ is unusual. Guided by Augustine, he takes his cue from St. Paul⁴⁶ and opens up what may at first appear to be a very limited subject matter. He uses his next heading, *modus*, also borrowed from the contemporary liberal arts *accessus*, to spell out the permutations of this universal Body. He explains that the prophet’s⁴⁷ *modus* includes referring sometimes to both Christ and the Church, sometimes only to one or the other. Gilbert further specifies that in speaking of Christ, the prophet can refer either to His divine or His human natures; in addition, Christ can be spoken of by transference or adoption (*transumptione*) as Ecclesia itself, the members of the faithful, “saying about Christ that which really only refers to the members.” About Ecclesia, furthermore, there are two ways in which the prophet can speak: referring either to the perfect or to the imperfect, that is

sorrowfully to the conclusion that “Cassiodorus’ influence on medieval culture was, to be blunt, insignificant”; *Cassiodorus* (Berkeley, 1979), 239; now we know we can add Gilbert to the list of Cassiodorus’ beneficiaries.

⁴⁵ Comments to Psalm 21: “est autem ista narratio non tecta figuris sicut prophetia sed manifeste sicut in evangelio.” H. C. van Elswijk notes this in “Gilbert Porreta als glosator van het Psalterium,” in *Jubileumbundel voor G. P. Kreling* (Nijmegen, 1953), 293.

⁴⁶ 1 Cor 12:12, 27: “For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ . . . Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it.”

⁴⁷ Gilbert speaks of the “prophet” here instead of the “author”; he treats the problem of authorship later in the *accessus*. See below.

to say, the heavenly Church Triumphant or the earthly Church Militant. Thus with the statement of the Psalter's *materia* as the Body of Christ and through an analysis of the prophet's *modus*, Gilbert has marked out as his proper territory a broad spectrum of concern, ranging from speculation on the dual nature of Christ as God and man—so important to the economy of salvation—to the pastoral problems confronting the struggling, imperfect individuals who make up the earthly component of Ecclesia. In a sense, he is claiming for his working definition of *sacra pagina* both “ethical” and “speculative” terrain. We have already seen that Gilbert makes the same claim through his cross-index subjects, which combine both pastoral and theoretical questions with a thoroughly academic apparatus. Gilbert's expansion of his text's *materia* by means of the prophet's *modus* therefore is a striking manifestation of the ongoing effort to “professionalize” the teaching of Scripture.⁴⁸

Before proceeding to the next item in the *accessus*, another look at Gilbert's description of the *materia* discloses what he thought the subject matter was *not*. Gilbert's statement of the *materia* of the Psalter excludes any reference to what might be thought of as the literal subject matter, namely the laments, exultations and prayers of David and his nation, or the historical circumstances to which these alluded. Nonetheless, Gilbert insists on the clarity, and the literalness, of his text and his exposition of it. Gilbert's use of the phrase *ad litteram* might surprise us until we recognize the distinction Gilbert makes between the literal and the historical.

When Gilbert refers to “history”, he means the narration of actual events pertaining to the generation of the psalm in its real time and place, or the events depicted in them. He usually confines any exegetical observations on the historical level to the abbreviated *accessus* with which he introduces each individual psalm, and then only on certain occasions does he deem it necessary for a full appreciation of the psalm under consideration. Historical exegesis is, for Gilbert, only a starting point, a sort of bow to the Servian “life of the author” prologue entry, a bit of interesting but ultimately incidental background information.

⁴⁸ For concurrent attempts to redefine *sacra pagina* in an academic sense, see Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology*, 31–32. For the “professionalization” of Scripture study in the latter part of the century, and the continued importance of the Psalms, see Marcia L. Colish, “Teaching and Learning Theology in Medieval Paris,” *Schools of Thought in the Christian Tradition*, ed. P. Henry (Philadelphia, 1984), 109, 115.

The burden of meaning was carried in the “literal” exposition, which, for Gilbert, is whatever the author of the Psalms originally intended to be understood as the primary sense. Since the author in question is a prophet, Gilbert understands the primary sense to be the prophecy. Therefore Gilbert can understand “the heavens announce the glory of God (*coeli enarrant gloriam dei*)” (Ps 18:1) *ad litteram* as the star which announced the birth of Christ at Bethlehem.⁴⁹ Since Psalm 18 is (according to Gilbert) one of the psalms which speak of the Incarnation, the birth of Christ is the prophet’s primary message, and anything which conveys that story is therefore the literal sense.

Gilbert’s understanding of “literal” is not unusual. We can compare it to the distinction between the literal and historical senses maintained by Hugh of Saint-Victor, for whom the literal sense is “the form of words (*forma verborum*)”, while the historical sense is “the truth of deeds (*veritas rerum gestarum*)”. For Hugh, the understanding of the literal sense leads to the historical truth, which in turn allegorically signifies a higher Truth.⁵⁰ As Beryl Smalley pointed out, Hugh grasped (as did Gilbert) that “the clue to prophecy and metaphor is the author’s intention; the literal sense includes everything which the sacred author meant to say.”⁵¹ Gilbert would agree with Hugh that in general, things are more trustworthy as signifiers than are words; language was, after all, arbitrarily imposed by humankind (cf. Gen 2:19–20).⁵²

Gilbert’s idea of literality reflects his ideas about the limits of human language. In his commentary on Boethius’ *De trinitate*, Gilbert would note that there are gaps between reality, the linguistic expression of that reality, and our understanding of the linguistic expression.⁵³

⁴⁹ This example is noted by Van Elswijk, “Gilbert Porreta als Glossator,” 300.

⁵⁰ Hugh of Saint Victor, Commentary on the Pentateuch; written before 1125. Cited in G. R. Evans, *The Language and Logic of the Bible: The Earlier Middle Ages*, (Cambridge, 1984), 69.

⁵¹ Smalley, *Study*, 101.

⁵² In his commentary on Boethius’ *De Hebdomadibus* Gilbert affirmed that of all the rules governing the various branches of knowledge, only those pertaining to grammar were not self-evident. They were “positive (*positivae*)”, imposed arbitrarily by humans: *De Hebd.* 1:12, ed. Häring, *The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers* (Toronto, 1966), 189–90. See also Evans, *Language and Logic*, 56.

⁵³ Gilbert, *De Trinitate* I, 3[prol]:21–24: “Tria quippe sunt: res et intellectus et sermo. Res intellectu concipitur, sermone significatur. Sed neque sermonis nota, quicquid res est, potest ostendere neque intelligentie actus in omnia, quaecumque sunt eiusdem rei, offendere ideoque nec omnia conceptus tenere” etc.; ed. Häring, *Commentaries on Boethius*, 67–68. See also Häring, “Commentary and Hermeneutics,”

Therefore, to get beyond the *integumentum*, the best one can do (*pace* deconstructionists) is try to fathom the original intention of the author. There is no such exact statement in Gilbert's Prologue to his Psalms commentary, but this is in effect what Gilbert attempts to do: the intention of the prophetic author controls the primary signification, and therefore the literal meaning, of the text, and Gilbert trusts himself to see past the insufficient letter to the author's purpose.⁵⁴

Gilbert turns to the *intentio* next. This entry reflects the wording of Servius and the *artistae*, the liberal arts scholars, but as Gilbert defines it, it corresponds more closely to the *utilitas* of Boethius. The emphasis which Gilbert places on the philosophical "usefulness" of the Psalter reflects Gilbert's pastoral viewpoint, reminding his readers that for layperson as well as for monk, the purpose of the Book of Psalms is more than mere moral edification; it is, like philosophy, instruction for the living of a perfect life. In the course of his discussion of *utilitas*, Boethius defines philosophy and its two "species", theoretical (speculative) and practical (active) philosophy. His description of active philosophy seems to be what Gilbert has in mind for the purpose of the Psalter: to improve the interior life of the individual, the conduct of his personal affairs, and his contributions to the community; in other words, to encourage the proper attitude and conduct of each member of Ecclesia.⁵⁵ Therefore the intended utility of the Psalter is not merely "to win God's favor" as a commentator might write that the *intentio* of Ovid's *Tristia* was to "win Augustus' favor";⁵⁶ rather, the Psalms were composed for a far more magnificent purpose: that those who were lost in Adam might be saved from sin and returned to everlasting life by Christ.⁵⁷ It is the individuals who make up Ecclesia who are to benefit from the Psalter's guiding words. The *intentio* of the Psalter is nothing less than the economy of salvation. Gilbert underscores the theme with Pauline

in *Renaissance and Renewal*, 196. For a concise review of Gilbert's linguistic views, see Lauge O. Nielson, *Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century* (Leiden, 1982), 103–114. Also see discussion of prophecy below.

⁵⁴ For the language of the Psalter being "without figures", see n. 45 above.

⁵⁵ Boethius, *In Isagogen Porphyrii Commenta*, (CSEL 48): 7–9.

⁵⁶ In an *accessus* to Ovid's *Tristia*: "intentio est ut per scripta sua unumquemque moneat ut pro eo ad Cesarem intercedant". Ed. R. B. C. Huygens, *Accessus ad auctores* (Leiden, 1970) 35–36; cited in Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, 101.

⁵⁷ "... ut perditū in Adam Christo, per quem solum peccata dimittuntur, et immortalitas redditur, conformenter; id est sicut portaverunt imaginem terreni, portent imaginem celestis."

chords, speaking of “conforming” to Christ, and adapting I Cor 15:49: “so as they bore the image of earthly man, they might bear the image of the heavenly Man.”

Gilbert finally turns to the heading *titulus*, which in the average “modern” liberal arts *accessus* was the first item to be discussed. It is well placed here, since it adds an interesting dimension to the *intentio* just pronounced by Gilbert. A. J. Minnis maintains that an *intentio* built upon an allegorical *materia* such as Gilbert has constructed renders superfluous any consideration of the work’s original purpose, and neglects the immediate aims of the actual human author.⁵⁸ This is not the case in Gilbert’s prologue, because of his interest in the affective impact of the Psalms as literary works, as the artistic expression of David, in addition to being divine revelation. Cassiodorus may have prompted Gilbert to think about the Psalms this way, since in the *Expositio* he revels in the Psalter’s wealth of decorative literary devices. Similarly, Hilary of Poitiers shows an interest in the Psalms as musical compositions. Gilbert’s own training seems to have been far stronger in rhetoric than in music, for his appreciation of the artistry and performance of the Psalms is translated in terms of the “modern” *accessus* familiar to him. His entry *intentio* had covered the salvific and philosophical utility of the Psalms, but this does not exhaust his consideration of the author’s purpose. Gilbert recognized that the human psalms-poet also had a more immediate aim, as did Ovid or any author. It is this second, human intention which Gilbert addresses under the item *titulus*.⁵⁹

The “title” of the Book of Psalms is “the book of hymns (*liber hymnorum*)”, which prompts Gilbert to define “hymn”, namely praising God through song; song itself, he explains, is an exultation of the mind, breaking forth from eternity into voice.⁶⁰ The notion of

⁵⁸ Minnis, *Authorship*, 46–47. Minnis advances the same reservation for the *intentio* ascribed to the pagan authors, for the same reason: that the medieval commentators “were more interested in relating the work to an abstract truth than in discovering the subjective goals and wishes of the individual author.” The result of this attitude, says Minnis, is the neglect of the humanity of the author, be he Ovid or David: *ibid.*, 21.

⁵⁹ Boethius had already suggested the connection between the understanding of the title and the intention; *In Isag. Por. Com.*, (CSEL 48): 5.

⁶⁰ “Hymnus est laus dei cum cantico [metrice scripta. plata voce intelligibili vel non intelligibili]. Canticum vero est mentis exultatio de eternis prorumpens in vocem.” The first part of the definition is commonly found in medieval commentaries: “hymnus est laus dei metricè composita” (Ps-Remigius, *PL* 131; Honorius, *PL* 172; Ps-Bede, *PL* 93) or “laus dei cum cantico” (*Glossa ordinaria*, *PL* 113; Ps-Haymo, *PL* 116).

exultation which Gilbert introduces into this otherwise standard definition of “hymn” may have been prompted by his liberal arts training in rhetoric, specifically the aim of a speaker to appeal to the *affectus* or disposition of his hearers, in order to persuade them. Gilbert muses that the title “book of hymns” is well chosen, since the author (as prophet) intends not only to teach about Christ, but also (as poet) to lead the disposition of carnal man to the praise of Christ. For that reason, he notes, the prophet wrote the psalms metrically, ornamenting them with pleasing manners of speaking, and performed them publicly with a variety of instruments and vocalisations; this pleasurable sensory manifestation of praise attracts a wide audience and results directly in the popularity, “once in the Synagogue and now in Ecclesia”, of the psalms above all other Scripture.⁶¹ It is the poetic, musical, stimulating, affective quality of the psalms which Gilbert recognizes as their peculiar power, and he credits the musician-prophet with recognizing it too.

Gilbert puts slightly more emphasis on the persuasive force of the psalms than do most of his contemporaries, but the interest in the affective quality of sacred writings is evident elsewhere, notably in the work of Thierry of Chartres. This readiness to ascribe to the Psalms that power of inciting passions, for which ancient poetry had been so mistrusted, is a step (a small step) toward seeing Scripture as literature as well as revelation. It is a step toward including *sacra pagina* in a curriculum based on the liberal arts. It is a step toward breaking the monopoly of the Holy Spirit on the *modus tractandi*, and giving at least some of the credit to the human author.⁶² It is not, however, a step towards what we would define as literal exegesis, since if anything Gilbert is more inclined to explain David’s poetry figuratively, the more emotionally moving and affective it becomes.

Having finished with *materia*, *modus*, *finis* (which term Gilbert uses alternatively for *intentio*) and *titulus* for the Psalter as a whole, Gilbert

Letbert of Lille (Ps-Rufinus, *PL* 21) adds some details. None relates the act of singing to the *affectus* of the audience or the intention of the poet, as does Gilbert.

⁶¹ “Bene autem dicitur ‘liber hymnorum’; intendit enim propheta non solum de Christo, que proponit docere, verum etiam docendo affectum carnalium hominum ad eandem laudem trahere. Unde et metricè scripsit, et diversis loquendi generibus opus ornavit, et ante archam voce et instrumentis et maxime cum psalterio, ipse cum multis et coram multis cantavit. Unde etiam et olim in synagoga et nunc in ecclesia, pre ceteris scripturis psalmi frequentantur.”

⁶² See Minnis, *Authorship*, 49–50, 139.

notes that each individual psalm had its own matter, mode, purpose and title, which he promises to treat in turn. The reader is thus informed in advance that a miniature *accessus* will be provided for each of the one hundred and fifty psalms to follow. And with this Gilbert departs from the “modern” liberal arts *accessus* and constructs his own.

Boethius, in his *accessus*, discusses the genus of philosophy to which his subject belongs; the *artistae* of Gilbert’s generation follow his lead. Servius, commenting on a literary rather than a philosophical work, proposes instead to treat of the type of songs or poems involved. Neither of these satisfied Gilbert, so he too invents a new entry, the “type of prophecy (*genus prophetiae*)”. One is allowed to regret that Gilbert did not emulate Servius, and discuss in his prologue the different types of psalms, or attempt to place them in a larger context of music; he would have found a ready source in Hilary.⁶³ Gilbert redeems himself somewhat by including brief remarks on the subject of music when the *titulus* of a given psalm allows him the opportunity. Thus in Psalm 4, the first psalm to bear the title *psalmus cantici*, we get a breakdown of the different combinations of voice and instrument, along with an allegorical explanation of their significance.⁶⁴

Similarly one might ask why Gilbert did not rise to the challenge of placing the Psalms into a precise category of knowledge, as *pars philosophiae* would demand. Later in his life he would include *theologia* as a subspecies of speculative science, along with ethics (moral science) and logic (rational science).⁶⁵ But at this stage in his career,

⁶³ Hilary of Poitiers, *Tractatus super psalmos*, ed. A. Zingerle (Vienna, 1891), *Instructio psalmorum*, cap. 19–23. (*CSEL* 22).

⁶⁴ From comments to Psalm 4: “*Psalmus instrumenti, canticum humane vocis sonus est. Aliquando vero sine instrumento humana voce ante archam, psalmus recitabatur, et appellabatur canticum. Aliquando instrumento sine voce humana cantabatur, et dicebatur psalmus. Aliquando precinente instrumento, voce acclamabat chorus et dicebatur psalmi canticum. Aliquando precedente voce chori, sequebatur sonus instrumenti, et dicebatur cantici psalmus. Quod tamen ad significationem magis spectabat. Nam psalmus, qui manuum pulsu sit, bonam operationem significat; canticum, quod est vocis, exultationem.*” (B.N. lat 12004, fol. 4v. This loosely paraphrases part of Hilary’s discussion in his preface; see note above. I have found nothing remotely similar in any of the commentaries, except for Letbert, the first half of whose prologue reproduces verbatim the entire section on music from Hilary’s preface.

⁶⁵ Gilbert explores this problem in his commentary on the second chapter of Boethius’ *De Trinitate*. For a brief discussion of Gilbert’s division of the sciences, see Nielsen, *Theology and Philosophy*, 90–98; for a detailed analysis of theology as a science, 115–142. See also Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology*, 31–32.

Gilbert is still clearly attuned to the Laon approach to biblical exegesis, that is, a lively mix of pastoral education and theoretical questions along with solid patristic backing. If pressed, perhaps he would have classified the Psalter under "ethics", though it would have looked uncomfortable there alongside Horace and Juvenal.⁶⁶ So, instead of either of the choices proffered by his available models, Gilbert preferred to explore a new category of knowledge, the *genus prophetiae*.⁶⁷

Gilbert devotes nearly half of his concise prologue to this discussion of prophecy, emphasizing the importance which he grants the topic. In a sense, his examination of prophecy amounts to an epistemology of the Psalter, ratifying its validity and exploring by what means and by what authority the Psalter communicates its wisdom to the reader.

Gilbert begins with Cassiodorus' often-repeated formula: "Prophecy is the divine breath which proclaims with unshakeable truth the outcome of events through the deeds or words of certain persons."⁶⁸ While otherwise following Cassiodorus very closely in his discussion of prophecy, Gilbert seems to take a cue from Remigius at this point, for where Cassiodorus uses *aspiratio*, Remigius and Gilbert substitute *inspiratio*.⁶⁹ The effect of this minor change is immediately to redirect

⁶⁶ The Book of Proverbs was, in fact, identified under "ethics" as moral philosophy by Origen and (following him) Isidore. Other parts of the Bible were less obvious: Origen puts the Song of Songs under the heading theoretical/contemplative knowledge, but Isidore thinks it is rational/logical; see Minnis, *Authorship*, 26. Honorius Augustodunensis has another opinion: Genesis pertains to physics (natural science), the Epistles of Paul to ethics, and the Psalms to logic (rational science, or "theorica"). For Honorius, the entire Psalter is a great spiritual syllogism: *PL* 172:270, 279. For Ps-Bruno the Carthusian too, the Psalms are principally "theorica, id est contemplatio" though certain ones also pertain to ethics: *PL* 152:638–9. In Ps-Bruno's commentary, the intention/utility of the Psalms is purely spiritual, not (as in Gilbert's) active—as befits, perhaps, a Carthusian perspective.

⁶⁷ The phrase, though by no means Gilbert's adaptation of it, actually occurs in Hilary, during the discussion of psalms as music: "Per has enim superscriptionum proprietates intelligentiam psalmodum quaeri oportebit, quia unicuique generi prophetiae in proprietate titularum unumquodque genus musicae comparationis aptatum est." *Tractatus*, Instr. ps. cap. 21. It turns up, surprisingly, in Ps-Bruno, immediately after his discussion of *pars philosophiae* (though he does not use the *accessus* term there; see note above). His description of prophecy is brief.

⁶⁸ "Prophetia est aspiratio divina quae eventus rerum aut per facta aut per dicta quorundam immobili veritate pronuntiat;" *Expositio Psalmorum* praefatio, cap. 1; English translations by P. G. Walsh, ed. Cassiodorus: *Explanation of the Psalms* (New York, 1990).

⁶⁹ The marginal reference here cites Remigius, and in fact "*inspiratio*" is to be found in the real Remigius (as well as in the Pseudo); P. A. Vaccari, "Il genuino

the reader's thoughts from the celestial "exhalation" of prophetic knowledge to the recipient of the "inspiration": in this instance, the prophet, the human author of the Psalms. Though Gilbert goes on to cover all the types of prophecy listed by Cassiodorus, even those which do not employ the medium of a poetic mouthpiece (such as portentous births), the reader is alerted to apply all of these means to the Psalter, and is therefore all the better prepared to see the divine Word in the historical action depicted in the Psalms.

Cassiodorus' definition of prophecy includes the statement that this breath from heaven announces truth "through deeds or words (*aut per factum aut per dictum*)". It has been claimed that Cassiodorus thus excludes from his definition the "highest kind" of prophecy, that of direct celestial inspiration.⁷⁰ Father Van den Eynde reports that Gilbert attempted to broaden Cassiodorus' formula by omitting the phrase "through deeds or words". He does not mean to suggest that Cassiodorus denies this type of prophecy, for of course he does not: it is, in fact the kind of prophecy with which he credits David. But taken as a handy, one-line definition of prophecy (which it frequently was), Cassiodorus' sentence does have this shortcoming, and Gilbert deftly solves the problem merely by moving the limiting phrase and his consideration of it a bit further along in his analysis of prophecy, where it does not interfere with the definition.

Gilbert takes Cassiodorus' list of the "many means" by which prophecy is manifested, and arranges them into categories and sub-categories, supplying a structure lacking in his source. He begins with Cassiodorus' final observation, that prophecy can be about the past, the present or the future, a distinction well worth making since all three are well represented in the Psalms. Then, before rejoining his source, Gilbert notes that prophecy can be not only *in bonis*, but also *in malis*, that is to say through the intermediary of evil (or at least pagan or otherwise suspect) individuals, as in the case of Balaam,

commento ai Salmi di Remigio de Auxerre," 66–68. However, Gilbert bases himself much more closely on Cassiodorus than on Remigius for this discussion, suggesting that Gilbert chose between the two words; Cassiodorus himself speaks of prophecy as divine "inspiration" later in his discussion. Among near-contemporary commentaries, those of Ps-Haimo and Ps-Bede use "inspiratio"; they show dependence on Gilbert's commentary in other ways as well (see chapter 4). Letbert, Ps-Bruno and Honorius omit parallel discussions. Whether or not Gilbert chose one locution over the other, the result is the same.

⁷⁰ Damian Van den Eynde, "Literary Note on the Earliest Scholastic *Commentarii in Psalmos*," *Franciscan Studies* 14 (1954): 136.

Caiphas, the Sybil, and the “infidel philosophers”. This may be the earliest instance of such a company in attendance at a discussion of prophecy,⁷¹ and suggests that Gilbert did not accept that such individuals were demon-inspired, but rather that divine wisdom allowed them to speak the truth when it suited divine purpose. It also may be Gilbert’s way of preparing the reader to expect major prophecies coming from King David at his least edifying. In other words, it is a reassurance that the prophecy itself is not affected by the prophet’s virtue or lack thereof, any more than the efficacy of a sacrament is affected by the officiating priest’s personal qualities.⁷²

Returning to Cassiodorus, Gilbert presents his source’s listing of the types of prophecy with few changes other than a neat classification of the species: prophecy by words or by deeds, actually or “manifestly”; prophecy only perceived as being said or done, *i.e.* by visions and dreams. (He omits Cassiodorus’ mention of clouds and heavenly voices.) Finally, Gilbert presents Cassiodorus’ description of the highest (or at least most direct) level of prophecy, that of the Holy Spirit illuminating the prophet “inwardly (*interius*)”, with no need of media. Cassiodorus offers two Scriptural passages in support of this type of prophecy: “And the spirit of the Lord came mightily upon David” and “If David, in the Spirit, calls him Lord.”⁷³ To these Gilbert adds corroborating evidence from the prophet-king David himself: “Let me hear what the Lord will speak to me.”⁷⁴

In his handling of the earlier items on the *accessus*, Gilbert had skirted the thorny problem of the authorship of the Psalms by referring, when any designation was necessary, to “the prophet”. Now, in his discussion of prophecy as it is manifest in the Psalter, Gilbert can

⁷¹ Van den Eynde, “Literary Note,” 142. No one else (to my knowledge) mentions this foursome: Ps-Bede and Ps-Haymo both mention “Sybil *vate*” and the infidel philosophers, and add that these, “qui multa divino instinctu de Christo praedixerunt”, prophesied “by permission.” Among the next generation of commentaries, Gerhoch of Reichersberg (*PL* 193:637–638) returns to the Cassiodoran version, and Peter Lombard (*PL* 191:59) mentions only Caiphas and Balaam.

⁷² This could be seen as evidence of the medieval commentator’s tendency to brush aside the actuality of the human author; see Minnis, *Authorship*, 47. But see below for the significance of the historical David’s life.

⁷³ “Et directus est Spiritus Domini in David” and “Si David in Spiritu vocat eum Dominum”: identified as “First book of Kings”, *i.e.* I Sam 16:13, and “Evangelium”, Matt 22:43 conflated with verse 45. The latter is an especially apt reference, since in this passage Matthew reports Christ citing Psalm 109 to confirm His Godhead.

⁷⁴ “Audiam quid loquatur in me Dominus”: Psalm 84:9.

begin to deal with the full story: there is more than one author, or stage of authorship, to be considered. The primary author, in fact the only one Gilbert can consider an *auctor* in the full sense of the word, is that Spirit of God who spoke directly and internally, without the imperfect intermediary of human language, to David. Therefore the real author/authority of the Psalms—the author of the *materia*—is God in the Person of the Holy Spirit. Gilbert provides the etymology of “soliloquy” (another of the traditional “titles” of the Psalter) as *solius spiritus eloquia*, which may be translated as “the language of the Spirit alone” and concludes that “since he is taught by the Spirit alone, and prophesied above all others, preeminently psalms are called ‘soliloquies’ and he is called ‘prophet’ (*quia solo docente spiritu et pre ceteris prophetavit, per excellentiam et psalmi soliloquia appellantur, et iste propheta*)”.

But then the message of the Spirit has to be communicated by the prophet, and here Gilbert parts company with Cassiodorus. For Cassiodorus, the rhetorical devices of Scripture were invented, as it were, by God Himself, in order to convey infinite truths through the medium of a miserably finite language. Figures and tropes are a divine compromise, suggests Cassiodorus, so that the Word can escape the constraints of human language. In Cassiodorus’ view, Scripture is itself pure language, anterior to ornament, which itself creates ornament by the very need to express unadorned truth. Thus it becomes the duty of the commentator to analyze the ornaments in order to decipher the real language of Scripture. This is what Courtès calls “Cassiodorus’ paradox”.⁷⁵

In contrast, Gilbert finds that the *integumentum* is more the domain of the earthly *auctor*. The compositional and rhetorical skills of the musician king David are the agent of transmission, and it is essential to provide oneself with the knowledge of the rules which govern this mode of communication in order to interpret it correctly and to unwind all the rich layers of meaning which will provide the interpretation with its depth. Gilbert has already indicated that he recognizes the situation, that he is prepared to enter into David’s historical context and affective mode, so that the message of this secondary author can most accurately transmit the message of the primary Author. The figures and tropes therefore are not the invention of

⁷⁵ J. M. Courtès, “Figures et tropes dans le psautier de Cassiodore,” *Revue des études latines* 13 (1964): 362–366.

the Holy Spirit, hard pressed to give human utterance to the ineffable. In Gilbert's view, the Holy Spirit speaks directly, interiorly, wordlessly, to the prophet. It is the human receptacle who must strain to employ all his communication skills, to "fill to bursting" his own language with the message of God. Consequently, his words, phrases, even grammatical structure undergo shifts in signification away from their everyday meanings, resorting to oblique and ambiguous references. In other words, they must signify figuratively or metaphorically. The prophet does this through the human invention of language, utilizing every poetic and rhetorical means at his command. He is perhaps aided by the Spirit in this personal, artistic endeavor, but one is not encouraged by Gilbert to see David composing his Psalms with a Dove murmuring into his ear.⁷⁶

Thus according to Gilbert's appraisal, the two authors, human and divine, work in an intimate tandem. The prophet is not a mere mouthpiece, but an active participant, in his role as poet, in the communication of the Word. In another way too David takes an active part in the mechanics of prophecy. God, as Hugh of St. Victor suggested, could write things; His language was creation and action, whereas the language of mankind was mere human speech. In other words, human *auctores* signify through words, but God, the *auctor* of things, can signify through things. The divine authorship of the Psalms was not only effected by direct spiritual inspiration into the being of the human author, but the human author himself lived the very language of the divine message. That is to say, the historical experience of David's life is already a basic part of the meaning of the Psalms; it is an elemental layer of signification, authored directly by God. This is effectively a way by which God speaks about Himself figuratively, by skipping the level of human language altogether. Gilbert's realization of this leads him to a radical appreciation of the historical circumstances represented in the psalms, while essentially barring him from the possibility of a purely "literal" (in the modern sense) exegetical method.

⁷⁶ In general for the question of accommodation, see Evans, *Language and Logic*, esp. 110; Amos Funkenstein, "Scripture Speaks the Language of Man: the Uses and Abuses of the Medieval Principal of Accommodation," in *L'homme et son univers I*, ed. C. Wenin (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1986), 92-101. Not only the Evangelists but the great commentators were frequently illustrated as being dictated to by the Holy Spirit in columbine form, a pictorial expression of the conviction that divine inspiration was not the monopoly of the writers of Scripture.

There is yet a third authorial role playing in the book of Psalms, and the last *accessus* item will give Gilbert the opportunity to return to the subject. First, though, he quickly dispatches the entry *nominus libri*. Having already employed the *titulus* of the “modern” *accessus* to accomodate the title “book of hymns”, and having addressed the appellation “book of soliloquies” under the discussion of prophecy, Gilbert still has to account for the name “*psalterium*”. He puts his explanation under the heading “name of the book”, apparently modelled on the Servian entries “number and order of the books”. Gilbert gives the Latin and Hebrew equivalents for the Greek word *psalterium*, gives the briefest of digressions on this musical instrument, and notes the correspondence between the ten strings on a psaltery and the ten Commandments.⁷⁷ That, incidentally, is about the extent to which Gilbert is interested in the significance of numbers; in the course of the commentary he regularly leaves out Cassiodorus’ numerological observations. For comparison one may note the commentary of Honorius, who quite loses himself in the rapturous contemplation of integers.⁷⁸

Gilbert finally proceeds to his final two *accessus* entries, which are taken from the Servian model and have no parallel in the “modern” *accessus* paradigm. The *numerus librorum* is divided by Gilbert into the number of the psalms (there are one hundred and fifty) and a discussion concerning the number of books. He follows Cassiodorus⁷⁹ in pointing out that Jerome was mistaken in dividing the Psalter into five books marked by a doxology (*fiat, fiat*) at the end of each book.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ Among contemporary commentaries, the parallel of the Ten Commandments is omitted only by the real Remigius (Vaccari, 67). The fact that the psaltery sounds from the top of its deltoid shape calls forth imaginative responses, from a comparison of the psaltery to Christ’s body (Hilary, *Tractatus Instr. ps. c.7*, thence Cassiodorus, *Ex. Ps. praef. c.4*) to Ps-Remigius (who gets the instrument upside-down!) urging his readers that striking the lowly strings, *i.e.* mortifying the flesh, will result in song pleasing to God (*PL* 131:147). Gilbert uses Hilary’s translations (organum, nablum and psalterium) but not his metaphor. Gerhoch dwells lovingly on details (comparing the “dead animals” which cover the instrument to ourselves); but later he adds an insightful passage on the affective quality of the psaltery which Gilbert would have appreciated (*PL* 193:629, 636).

⁷⁸ Honorius’ epilogue to his Psalms commentary charts the history and development of the Church through ages represented by each decade of the psalter: *PL* 172:308.

⁷⁹ Cassiodorus, *Ex. Ps. praef. c.12*, (*CCSL* 97:15).

⁸⁰ Namely, after Psalms 40, 71, 88 and 105. The Psalter was apparently divided thus in imitation of the Pentateuch: see the *New Oxford Annotated Bible* (New York, 1962), 656.

For proof of this, Gilbert cites Hilary of Poitiers, the ancient Hebrews, and the Acts of the Apostles, which speaks of the “book” of Psalms in the singular.⁸¹

The “order” of the Psalms is problematical. Gilbert points out that the one hundred and fifty psalms are not arranged in any evident chronological, narrative or historical order. The order that they are in reflects the work of the prophet Esdras, according to the belief reported by Gilbert.⁸² This compounds both the primary and the secondary authorial intervention, since Esdras himself must have been prophetically moved, and presumably the order of the psalms has a concomittant signification. Gilbert does not pretend to know just what this signification is. He notes that while one can discern the reasoning behind Esdras’ placement of certain of the psalms, even the Fathers gave up trying to explain the placement of many of them.⁸³ There is no question of actually rearranging them, though, in a more practical or rational order, for their arrangement too is part of the divine language: another veil of *integumentum*. Having duly reported this, Gilbert declines any further responsibility for Esdras’ order; as we have seen in chapter two, Gilbert had his own rearrangement in mind.

For Cassiodorus, too, the Psalms had a triple authorship, but he does not consider—indeed, he does not even mention—Esdras as the third author. For Cassiodorus, it is the monk who is reciting the psalms, “as in his own name” and from his own experience, who recreates the psalms constantly.⁸⁴ It is indicative of Gilbert’s essentially non-contemplative approach that he dismisses this possibility; for his students, daily recitation of the Psalms was perhaps something they would retire to, but was clearly not an immediate concern.

⁸¹ Acts 1:20, “Scriptum enim est in libro psalmorum . . .”

⁸² Hilary’s advice is “quae traditio ab Esdra, quantum creditur, psalmos post captivitatem in unum librum colligente profecta, si falsa aut improbabilis existimabitur . . . Absolutum enim est, non potuisse eos nisi prophetis prophetantibus prophetari”: *Tractatus Instr.* ps. c.4. Ps-Bede (in more detail than Gilbert) and Honorius (more briefly) recount Esdras’ role; Ps-Bede gives his source as Augustine: *PL* 93:482; *PL* 172:271. The marginal reference in the manuscripts of Gilbert’s commentary claim “Rem”; the genuine Remigius does have “Sed ab Esdra propheta instinctu divino ita ordinati esse creduntur”: Vaccari, “Il genuino commento,” 68.

⁸³ “Cur autem ab Esdra ita sint ordinati, quamvis in quibusdam causa possit intelligi, in pluribus tamen indeterminatum patrum reliquit auctoritas.” Paris B.N. lat. 12004 fol. 2v Compare Ps-Bede: “Huius ordinationis causam atque notitiam beatus Augustinus soli Spiritui sancto fatetur relinquendam”: *PL* 93:482.

⁸⁴ Courtès, “Figures et tropes,” 366. Actually, Cassiodorus says he is quoting from Athanasius: Praef. c.16 (*CCSL* 97:22).

The question of the psalms' authorship is not exhausted in Gilbert's Prologue, however. There is still that nagging matter of the various individuals named in the titles to each separate psalm. In Late Antiquity these titles had become affixed to the psalms proper, and were also reported (mistakenly) to be the work of the busy Esdras. They inspired in medieval commentators a certain amount of exegetical acrobatics because of their enigmatic nature, a result of faulty transmission, corruption, and inaccurate translation from the Hebrew.⁸⁵ The most disturbing aspect of these titles, though, was that frequently they appeared to indicate authorship. While many carried such indications as "*Psalmus David*" or "*oratio David*", others proclaimed "*Psalmus Asaph*", "*in Salomonem*" or the surprising "*oratio Moys*". Majority opinion was that all one hundred and fifty psalms were written by David: Ambrose and Cassiodorus were adamant on this point, and were followed by the Carolingians and their heirs. But the vote was not unanimous. Jerome was just as adamant that the names in the titles indicated actual authors, and Hilary of Poitiers was categorical: he thought it "absurd" to suppose otherwise.⁸⁶ They were voices crying in the wilderness. The literal-historical point of view which they presupposed had yielded to the inexorable advance of the allegorical-tropological-anagogical trend in hermeneutics. The variety of names and the anachronisms in the titles of the psalms posed no embarrassment to those who saw David as the sole (human) author.

⁸⁵ For example, the title to Psalm 8 (as translated by the RSV from the Hebrew) reads: "To the choirmaster: according to The Gittith. A Psalm of David". As it appears in Gilbert's commentary, it reads "In finem. Pro torcularibus. Psalmus David." It devolved upon the commentator to make sense of often nonsensical translation of the names of Hebrew songs and technical terms of music (without knowing that that is what they were) and whatever else made it into these titles. "Ces titres étaient déjà très obscure pour les traducteurs grecs; ils en ont donné une version pleine de mystère, qui fournit une ample matière aux commentateurs portés à l'allégorie"; Pierre Salmon, *Les 'Tituli Psalmorum' des manuscrits latins*, Collectanea biblica latina, 12 (Rome, 1959), 10–11. Gilbert, following established tradition, translates "pro torcularibus" as "for the wine presses" and gives a credible, pastorally oriented account of it. See chapter four, p. 109ff.

⁸⁶ Ambrose, *PL* 14:922, 966, 1039; Augustine, *De civitate dei*, xvii.14 (*CSEL* 40:245–6); *De doctrina christiana* ii.8 (*CSEL* 80:41); Jerome, *Homiliae in Psalmos*, on Psalm 74, 77, and elsewhere (*CCSL* vol. 78:48, 64); cited by Minnis, *Authorship*, 43. Cassiodorus, who never mentions Esdras but who refers disapprovingly to "quidam" who mistakenly thinks the names refer to real authors: *Ex. ps. praef.* 2:18–24. Hilary's opinion: "Sunt autem plures eorundem psalmorum scriptores. Nam in aliquibus David auctor praescribitur, in aliquibus Salomon, in aliquibus Asaph, in aliquibus Idithun . . . Ex quo absurdum est psalmos David cognominare: cum tot auctores eorum ipsis inscriptionum titulis edantur": *Tractatus Instr.* ps. c.2.

Quite to the contrary, the names were welcomed because of the rich possibilities they opened for spiritual interpretation, and this was even proffered as the reason for Esdras' creation of them. Honorius, for example, says that Esdras prefixed the title "like keys to unlock the occult mysteries (*quasi claves ad reseranda occulta mysteria*)".⁸⁷

Gilbert chooses the road more travelled. Though he does not discuss the names in his Prologue, the miniature *accessus* to the second psalm provides him the occasion to air his views on the subject, for it is, as he notes, the first psalm with a title (psalm I stands as title for the entire psalter, and so allegedly was not given a separate title by Esdras).⁸⁸ Before interpreting the title (which is '*psalmus david*'), Gilbert transmits the prevailing opinion that Esdras added the titles "in order to reveal the entryway into the understanding of the psalms".⁸⁹ He adds that their interpretation is independent of any necessary historical association with the psalm itself. Rather, they are the means by which Esdras indicates the primary significance of the psalm, or as Gilbert puts it, what is being "figured" in the psalm. Gilbert therefore follows Cassiodorus, who follows Augustine, who leant, ironically, on Jerome's *Interpretation of Hebrew Names*,⁹⁰ for the significance of the names in the titles. Nonetheless, when a title alludes to actual circumstances in the life of David which occasioned certain psalms, Gilbert takes obvious pleasure in setting out the *vita poetae* (though he does not call it such), turning to other historical books of the Bible to eke out political or cultural details. This he does not so much out of a love for historical exegesis per se, but rather, as we have seen, out of the conviction that the historical

⁸⁷ Honorius, *PL* 172:271. Ps-Haimo, on the other hand, says that Esdras included historical characters from David's entourage in order to honor them; they are still to be interpreted spiritually (*PL* 119:336). Cassiodorus follows Augustine's spiritual interpretations but gives them, and the titles in general, even more weight; *Ex. ps. praef.* 10:1–27; see O'Donnell, *Cassiodorus*, 148; Ps-Bruno follows the same lead, giving even the most plausible titles of Esdras a spiritual interpretation (in his comments on Psalm 107: *PL* 152:1213). Ironically, despite his own opinion on the subject, Jerome's work on Hebrew names provided the grist for the allegorical mills, beginning with Augustine.

⁸⁸ "Huic psalmo non est ausus Esdras apponere titulum quia in sequentibus caput libri vocantur . . ." Ps 1:1; Paris B.N. lat 12004 fol. 2r.

⁸⁹ "Ut quasi in foribus psalmorem ad eorum intelligentiam pateret ingressus;" *ibid.* This sentiment is ubiquitous in the contemporary commentaries, though Gilbert's phrase is unusual.

⁹⁰ Jerome, it will be remembered, did not believe David to have been the sole author.

actuality of the protagonist's life are part of the prophetic language, the divine vocabulary of "writing in deeds", of the Psalter.

Thus in his carefully crafted *accessus*-Prologue, Gilbert tells his students what the Psalter is, what it tells us, how it tells us what it tells us, and what are the limits and difficulties and pleasures of this sacred work of literature. Although in the course of the commentary there will be plenty of spiritual admonition, there is a marked absence of any remarks on contemplation in the Prologue. Although there is a (perhaps) disappointing lack of concern with what we should call literal exposition, the basis for the allegorical interpretation is laid out with admirable rigor, and with an appreciation of the historical circumstances which gives real depth to the allegory. Gilbert's academic Prologue is succinct, precise and extremely well organized; while at first view he seems mostly content to marshal patristic wisdom, he shows keen judgment on what to utilize and what to dismiss. One quickly comes to admire his dexterity in using the *accessus* formula to re-structure what he excises from Cassiodorus and others. Gilbert is willing to expend half the length of his entire Prologue on a necessary epistemology of the Psalms, seeing in the ramifications of the *genus prophetiae* a means of professionalizing the teaching of Scripture, of grafting it onto the branches of knowledge currently being taught in the schools. Gilbert's academic Prologue does not merely introduce his students to the study of the Psalter; it introduces the Psalter into the curriculum of the secular schools.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE SOURCES FOR GILBERT'S PSALMS COMMENTARY

Gilbert's Psalms commentary is the single most important source for Peter Lombard's Psalms commentary, but on what did Gilbert rely? The usual answer, "the *Glossa ordinaria*", turns out to be seriously problematic; this question will be addressed in due time. In the meantime, it may prove salutary to proceed directly from Gilbert's commentary. There is no better place to begin the search for Gilbert's sources than with those *auctoritates* which he names in the margins of his Psalms commentary.¹

The named sources

A rough survey of Gilbert's commentary yields a count of 565 references to Augustine and 249 to Cassiodorus, indicating them as his two principal sources.² Upon inspection, 'Augustine' is revealed to be the *Enarrationes in Psalmos* and 'Cassiodorus' is represented by his *Expositio Psalmorum*.³ Jerome is designated by the marginalia 106 times; Gilbert's use of Jerome is piecemeal and somewhat problematic, reflecting the fact that Jerome wrote no complete commentary on

¹ These references are discussed above in chapter 2, pp. 49–51.

² This count was taken from MS Balliol 36; though other manuscripts may exhibit minor differences, they are generally very consistent. Not every single borrowing is credited, but the references are a reliable indication of content. The numbers I give for citations for the Fathers excludes the Prologue and Psalm 118, which abounds in references to Hilary, Ambrose, Cassiodorus, Augustine and Remigius.

³ *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, ed. E. Dekkers, CCL 38–40 (Turnholt, 1956); *Expositio Psalmorum*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCL 97–98 (Turnholt, 1958). The *Enarrationes* (ca. 418) are Augustine's compilation and revision of his earlier public sermons and exegetical notes on the psalms, plus a commentary for Psalm 118 newly composed. Cassiodorus' much more homogeneous *Expositio*, based largely on Augustine's work, was composed probably while its author was in Constantinople (ca. 540–554) but was subsequently revised with the Vivarium (the double monastery founded by Cassiodorus in Squillace) in mind. Translations of citations taken from *St. Augustine on the Psalms*, tr. S. Heugan and F. Corrigan, Ancient Christian Writers 29 (Westminster, Maryland, 1960); *Cassiodorus: Explanation of the Psalms*, tr. P. G. Walsh, Ancient Christian Writers 51–53, (New York, 1990).

the Psalms.⁴ The Carolingian Remigius of Auxerre is fairly well represented, with 68 marginal notations, but his predecessors Alcuin and Haimo of Auxerre make only cameo appearances, as do the fourth-century Fathers Hilary of Poitiers and Ambrose. Careful comparison with the sources reveals that the marginal references reliably and accurately identify Gilbert's borrowings; however, the raw numbers cited above do not quite do justice either to the debt which Gilbert owes particularly to Augustine and Cassiodorus, nor to his own creativity in his use of his sources.

For Gilbert, *auctoritas* was not a sanctioned text or a canonical author but an idea, supportable by reason, expounded by a proven and trustworthy source. There were those for whom *auctoritas* was text: Robert of Melun would still insist, later in the century, that "authority resides in the words rather than in the opinion of the author".⁵ Yet the age had certainly passed when it sufficed to smother one's opponent in piles of patristic quotations in lieu of proof. Writers of merit knew they had to understand the context of the *auctoritas* they were citing, in order to be able to wield the reasoning behind it; as Rupert of Deutz averred, "we are not reckless worshippers of the blessed Augustine".⁶ Gilbert's own impatience with de-contextualized extracts was spotlighted rather sensationally during his trial for heresy in 1148. The prosecution was armed with patristic dicta written on stacks of *schedula*; Gilbert entered the episcopal palace in Reims with a train of clerics burdened with *codici integri*, entire volumes of the writings under consideration, from which he proceeded to read at length, supporting his views and lulling his audience to sleep. Geoffrey of Auxerre, to whom we owe this illuminating vignette, recounts with no trace of amusement how the prosecution

⁴ *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera*, pt. 2, *Opera homiletica: Tractatus sive Homiliae in Psalmos*, ed. E. Dekkers, CCL 78 (Turnholt, 1958). Translations taken from *The Homilies of Saint Jerome*, tr. M. L. Ewald, The Fathers of the Church, 48 (Washington, 1964). Gilbert's sources for Jerome are discussed below, note 21.

⁵ Robert of Melun, "auctoritatem in verbis auctoris potius consistere quam in sententia": *Sententia*, ed. R. Martin, *Oeuvres de Robert de Melun* 3 (Louvain, 1947), 24; cited by Smalley, *Study*, 229. Gilbert's opinion was precisely the reverse, following Hilary of Poitiers: see chapter 3, p. 82.

⁶ "Non sumus incauti adultores beati Augustini": Rupert of Deutz, *In Iohannem*, ed. Haacke, CCCM 9:7 (Turnholt, 1969); cited in Maria L. Arduini, "'Magistratio': 'Auctoritas', 'Traditio', 'Ratio' von Anselm zu Adelard von Bath," *Benedictine Culture, 750-1050*, ed. W. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst (Louvain, 1983) 190-233. See also J. de Ghellinck, *Le Mouvement Théologique du XII^e Siècle*, 2nd ed. (Bruges, 1948), 472-499.

emptied local libraries that evening in an attempt to out-codex the opposition.⁷

As entertaining as such anecdotes are, they also provide insight into Gilbert's use of his sources and his approach to writing a commentary. Far from "ordering" a gloss by selecting quotations and stringing them into a chain of commentary, Gilbert composes his work from the assembled raw materials he has culled from his sources. These raw materials, the ideas, reasonings and inspirations of dependable *auctores*, could be manipulated—not deformed, as a "waxen nose", but condensed, extrapolated, refined, recombined.⁸ Therefore, Gilbert does not feel constrained to follow any of his models psalm verse by psalm verse, seldom quotes them verbatim, and does not hesitate to choose among their opinions. His method of identifying his sources in the margins has, consequently, something of an air of challenge: the reader is not only informed of the source of the idea but is encouraged to return to the original work, compare it against Gilbert's adaptation, and judge the result.

Nonetheless, Gilbert reveals an even more radical dependence on the *Enarrationes* and the *Expositio* than the many references alone would suggest. As we have seen, Cassiodorus supplied the inspiration and suggested the apparatus for Gilbert's organizational program. The use of a finding device to aid the teaching of certain aspects of the Psalms was a contribution of Cassiodorus, as were the actual themes of the cross-index. Cassiodorus also supplies Gilbert with an analytical structure wholly lacking in other patristic commentaries,⁹ namely a distinct introductory segment for each psalm, consisting of two parts (a consideration of the psalm's title, and an examination of the formal divisions of the psalm) and a *conclusio* (in which a summary is mingled with devotional suggestions and thematic emphasis). These useful preliminaries are recast by Gilbert into the "modern" *accessus* framework (for example, Gilbert refers to Cassiodorus' *divisio psalmi* as the prophet's "mode" of proceeding), but the content as well as

⁷ Geoffrey was secretary to Bernard of Clairvaux, and was bitter about the outcome of the trial. *Epistola*, PL 185:589–590.

⁸ Alan of Lille, of course, argues that precisely because the waxen nose of authority is so malleable, it must be strengthened with reason: "Sed quia actoritas cereum nasum habet, id est in diversum potest flecti sensum, rationibus roborandum est." *De fide catholica contra hereticos* I, 30; PL 210:333. Cited in de Ghellinck, *Mouvement Théologique*, 472.

⁹ J. J. O'Donnell, *Cassiodorus* (Berkeley, 1979), 143–144, 152, 164.

the general tone advertise Cassiodorus' influence. Gilbert feels free to improve on his source: he will, for example, often refer to sources other than Cassiodorus for a more satisfying interpretation of a psalm's title; or he will modify (on his own authority, apparently) the divisions of the psalms presented by Cassiodorus, both concerning the subject matter of the particular division and where the divisions actually fall (a detail which Cassiodorus frequently omits to note in his introductions).¹⁰ This notion of marking the divisions within a psalm makes easier the exegete's task of addressing changes of voice and intention in the Psalmist's poetic diction, and also provides convenient stations for summing up, comparing and contrasting the various issues presented in the psalm as the master leads his students from one section to the next. For example, Gilbert introduces "part three" of Psalm 109: "While in part one [the prophet] spoke according to [Christ's] humanity '*Sede*' etc., and in the second part according to His divinity '*Tecum principium*', now in this third part His humanity is spoken of again, regarding His priesthood . . ."¹¹ The formal, structured approach to the text which Gilbert found in Cassiodorus, like the idea for the cross-index, is thus adapted to "modern" scholarly usage and turned into a useful pedagogical tool.

In addition to his other influences, Cassiodorus provided a specific christological focus which informs Gilbert's exegesis throughout. While earlier Christian exegetes had also seen the Psalter as prophecy of Christ, Cassiodorus brought to his commentary a sharply defined concern with orthodox Chalcedonian christology.¹² His insistence at every turn on the "two natures united and perfect" in Christ is enthusiastically embraced by Gilbert, whose Psalms commentary thus becomes an early manifestation of his own and the twelfth century's intense interest in the doctrine of the Incarnation and related christological problems.¹³

¹⁰ He does this particularly if a *diapsalmus* does not coincide with Cassiodorus' division; Gilbert accepts the *diapsalmus* as an intentional, formal division by the psalmist.

¹¹ "Cum in prima parte dixerit secundum humanitatem '*Sede*', etc., in secunda vero secundum divinitatem '*tecum principium*', nunc in hac tertia iterum loquitur secundum humanitatem de sacerdotio eius . . ." MS Paris B.N. lat. 12004, fols. 149v-150r. All subsequent citations from Gilbert's Psalms commentary will be taken from this manuscript, which is reliable and legible.

¹² O'Donnell, *Cassiodorus*, 166-172.

¹³ "... patres nostri duas naturas permanere in uno Domino Christo unitas atque perfectas dici et credi maluerunt." Cassiodorus, *Ex. Ps.* 80:210-211. Lauge O. Nielsen offers 1130 as the approximate date of the beginning of a "specifically thematic

Cassiodorus himself relied heavily and gratefully on Augustine, of course, but Gilbert does not depend on Cassiodorus to supply his Augustine. One finds rather that while Gilbert may look to Cassiodorus for structure and general tenor, Augustine's *Enarrationes* provides the bulk of the actual glosses. The reason for this appears to be that Gilbert found Augustine's more pastoral perspective more to his purpose than the ultimately meditative tone of the *Expositio*. Being of a scholarly and administrative turn of mind, Cassiodorus took pains with the organizational and pedagogical aspects of his commentary, but nonetheless the work was written first for private edification, and subsequently revised for a monastic audience.¹⁴ Augustine, on the other hand, personally delivered his sermons on the psalms to his own flock (or, in a few instances, wrote them in the form of "homilies, which may be preached to the people").¹⁵ When Augustine speaks of the whole Christ, Head and Members, he has the entire Church in mind, even—especially—its least perfect sons and daughters. His concern is the unity and the salvation of the lay community, not the individual pious reader or the sheltered monastic enclave. Therefore his specific interpretations, suggestions and admonitions are more likely to be pertinent to an audience who was being prepared to participate in an active pastoral life. Gilbert recognized this, and relied extensively on Augustine's insights.

Even so, it is rare to find Augustine quoted textually in Gilbert's commentary, and the reason is immediately clear: Augustine is simply far too verbose, too complex and too diffuse to be cited verbatim in a relatively slim volume. For one thing, the sermons which make up the *Enarrationes* were preached over a period of more than two decades, in various places and to differing audiences. Their improvisational character and unevenness of coverage were rendered somewhat more uniform by Augustine's revisions, but they still reflect their homiletic roots. Augustine's cogitations on the Psalmist's words impart a great deal of admonition and encouragement, but they do not

concern" with the doctrine of the Incarnation in early scholasticism: *Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century: A Study of Gilbert Porreta's Thinking and the Theological Expositions of the Doctrine of the Incarnation during the Period 1130–1180* (Leiden, 1982), 17.

¹⁴ Note his frequent references to his monastic community at Squillace, for example in his Preface; *Ex. Ps. praef.* 1–64. The work was first dedicated to his "pater apostolicus", most likely Pope Vigilius (537–555).

¹⁵ From Augustine's *proemium* to his sermons on Psalm 118: *En. in Ps. 118: proem.* 23–25; English translation in Hebgin and Corrigan, 3.

lend themselves readily to direct quotation; his witty plays on words and his musical phrasing were assets in sermons delivered orally, but such a style does not provide pithy definitions. To extract the most from the *Enarrationes*, therefore, Gilbert boils down lengthy and involved passages until they are a clear essence of Augustine's ruminations; in one typical instance, the gist of 23 printed lines of Augustine is rendered by Gilbert into four lines of commentary.¹⁶ This essence pervades Gilbert's commentary, even to the point of subtly flavoring contributions from his other sources.¹⁷

Gilbert applies the same technique to the only slightly less loquacious Cassiodorus, whose effusiveness he tones down with his own lapidary style.¹⁸ However, the specific explanations offered by Cassiodorus are less likely than those of Augustine to dominate Gilbert's exegesis, even while he accepts the overall focus of the psalm as identified by Cassiodorus. A striking example of this is provided by Gilbert's comments to Psalm 109. There is barely a line in it that is not identifiable as a paraphrase of one of these two patristic sources. Gilbert follows Cassiodorus' lead in pinpointing the subject matter of this psalm as the dual nature of Christ as God and man. He also accepts Cassiodorus' *divisio psalmi*, though he refines somewhat the identification of the topic of each section. Neither of these exegetical constructs appears in Augustine. Yet reference to "Cassiodorus" only appears once in the marginalia; in fact, a close reading reveals that the abridged words of Augustine are twice as likely to illustrate the Cassiodoran issues as are the words of Cassiodorus himself.¹⁹

Additional citations from Cassiodorus which are not directly related to the structure and to the announced theme of the psalm are

¹⁶ In the commentary of Psalm 6:8, Gilbert offers: "*Turbatus est a furore illo, hoc est iudicium quod incipit hii. Ubi sunt interiores tenebrae, cum aliqua luce, ubi est turbatus oculis, non extinctus. Tunc autem ei impii in summa cecitate cum penitus extra deum id est lucem, quod est in tenebros exteriores mittentur.*" B.N. lat. 12004 fol. 7v. Compare Augustine *En. in Ps.* 6:8.1-24.

¹⁷ For an example, see discussion of Remigius below.

¹⁸ For instance in regard to Psalm 138:13. Cassiodorus marvels: "*Terribiliter enim mirificatus est Pater, quando passionem Domini Christi tenebrae sunt secutae, terra contremuit, saxa dirupta sunt, sepulcra patuerunt, mortui resurrectione laetati sunt, cum ipse iterum in eodem corpore sancta resurrectione conspectus est, dum ad discipulos suos januis clausis intravit, dum caelos sub hominum visione conscendit . . .*" *Ex. Ps.* 138:283-289. Gilbert notes only that ". . . in passione tenebre secute sunt, petre scisse, et huius modi cetera." Paris B.N. lat. 12004 fol. 185v. His motto could be "*nil admirari*".

¹⁹ Working roughly from a line by line count, the Augustinian paraphrases occupy 107 lines; the Cassiodoran borrowings, 47 lines.

likely to be offered as alternative or optional explanations. Frequently Gilbert expresses his preference by presenting an Augustinian paraphrase first, then offering Cassiodorus' opinion introduced by "*vel*", or by giving the views of Cassiodorus first and then, as a better alternative ("*sed melius*"), Augustine's. However, Gilbert sometimes favors Cassiodorus for providing the occasional literal explanation lacking in Augustine, or for providing a key word or phrase which gives a fresh perspective or new depth to Augustine's argument.

Though Augustine and Cassiodorus are the preponderant influences on Gilbert's commentary, Jerome also adds to the patristic content of the exegetical matrix, primarily through his incomplete series of homilies on the Psalms.²⁰ Jerome's influence does not dominate the commentary the way Augustine and Cassiodorus do; his contributions tend to remain discrete. In other words, Gilbert seems to use Jerome not as a basis for but as a supplement to his commentary. Gilbert depends on Jerome primarily as a source of straightforward literal-historical explanation, introduced when such information is lacking in Gilbert's other sources. An example can be found in their comments on Ps. 101:6, "*adhaesit os meum carni meae* (my bones cleave to my flesh)". Gilbert explains the passage "According to the letter: [the psalmist] gives 'flesh' in lieu of 'skin', to which he says the bones adhere; so that they who do penance should learn to do it by the mortification of the flesh (*Ad litteram, carnem pro cute posuit, cui dixit os adherere, ut qui agunt, discant carnis maceratione penitentiam agere*)." Jerome has: "They who do penance learn how they ought to do penance. Thus I dessicated myself, so that I was without flesh, and my skin clung to my bones. He says 'flesh' instead of 'skin' (*Discant qui agunt paenitentiam, quomodo debeant agere paenitentiam. Ita enim exsiccavi memetipsum, ut sine carne essem, et pellis mea haereret ossibus meis. Carnem pro pelle dixit*)."²¹

Characteristically, Gilbert whittles down even Jerome's skeletal prose while retaining the literal and practical, pastoral sense: the psalmist, by saying that his flesh clings to his bones, teaches the penitent how to repent through fasting. But also typical is the seepage of vocabulary from one of Gilbert's sources into another; while Jerome uses the word "*pellis*" for skin, Gilbert introduces "*cutis*", which

²⁰ See above, note 4. I have not had the opportunity to determine if Gilbert himself referred to other works by Jerome.

²¹ Jerome, *Tractatus in Psalmos*, Ps. 101:27-30.

is to be found in Cassiodorus' (rejected) allegorical remarks on this verse.²² This sort of verbal osmosis recurs frequently in Gilbert's commentary, prompting a vivid picture of Gilbert, surrounded by his sources, reading each of them in turn before composing his remarks on each psalm.²³

There are also citations, attributed in the marginalia to Jerome, apropos of some psalms which were not the subject of commentaries by Jerome. In some of these cases it is clear that Gilbert is getting his Jerome secondhand, through the medium of Cassiodorus or Remigius. Cassiodorus, for example, frequently uses Jerome's *Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum*. Alternatively, the fact that the sigla "Ier" and "Rem" frequently occur together in the margins may suggest Remigius as Gilbert's source for some of these passages.²⁴ In a few places, however, such as in Psalm 7, the marginal notation spells out that "Jerome and Remigius agree", implying that the two were consulted separately and found to be in accord.

Other patristic authors are used but rarely by Gilbert: Hilary of Poitiers and Ambrose are indicated by marginal references only in Gilbert's Prologue and in the commentary to Psalm 118.²⁵ Gilbert's use of Hilary in the Prologue is not unusual,²⁶ since prior to the preface which Cassiodorus composed for his *Expositio*, that of Hilary was the only substantial model (Augustine's commentary included no actual preface, and those of Jerome and Ambrose were quite brief). Cassiodorus himself relied for this reason on Hilary's preface, though elsewhere in the *Expositio* his use of Hilary is scarce.²⁷ Ambrose wrote commentary for only a dozen psalms; his lengthy sermon on Psalm

²² Cassiodorus, *Ex. Ps.* Ps. 101:203–226.

²³ Other examples of this phenomenon are given below in the discussion of Remigius.

²⁴ For Cassiodorus' use of Jerome's "Interpretation of Hebrew Names", see *CCSL* 98:1357–1358 (index); see also note 33 below. For Remigius and Jerome, see notes 40 and 44 below.

²⁵ In both the Prologue and the commentary to Psalm 118, a string of sources is provided: "Hy(larius), Am(brosius), Cas(siodorus), Aug(ustinus), Ier(onymous)" are offered as a group and then in various combinations. One manuscript claims "Ysidorus" as well among the contributors to the Prologue, but that seems to be an isolated fancy on the part of the copyist.

²⁶ Hilary's preface seems to have been in vogue in the early part of the twelfth century: part of it was incorporated bodily into the version of Letbert of Lille's commentary published by Walter of Maguelonne: see pp. 117–118.

²⁷ He does refer once, apparently, to a passage from Hilary's comments on Psalm 118, but does so apropos of Psalm 110 (they are both "alphabetic" psalms). See *CCSL* 98:1358 (index) and 1014n.

118, however, circulated separately,²⁸ and Gilbert included it among his sources for that psalm.

In addition to these patristic sources, Gilbert acknowledged a few later exegetes: the Carolingians Alcuin and Haimo are represented sparingly, and Remigius more generously, in the marginalia. Alcuin is not known to have commented on the entire Psalter, but he did write an *Enchiridion* on two groups of psalms used frequently in ecclesiastical offices, the seven penitential psalms and the fifteen gradual psalms. These, and a commentary on Psalm 118, are printed in the *Patrologia latina*, though they seem to have been little circulated in their day.²⁹ I am not aware that the authenticity of this commentary has been questioned.

Gilbert's first use of Alcuin, as indicated by marginal notation, occurs in the course of his explanation of God's *ira* and *furor* in Psalm 2:5, an explanation which Alcuin offers apropos of the same two words found in Psalm 6:2 (Psalm 2 not being one of the psalms on which Alcuin commented).³⁰ Alcuin himself took the first part of his gloss on *ira et furor* almost verbatim from Cassiodorus, typically merely clarifying the lexical difference between the two similar words. Then—"sed"—Alcuin adds an insight of his own, which is neither in Cassiodorus nor in Augustine: that this *ira et furor* refer not to any immediate or obvious manifestation of God's displeasure, but to future, otherworldly punishment. Thus Gilbert uses Alcuin here to introduce the pastorally useful notion of individual sin and chastisement, rather than the more abstract musings on God's temperament on which Cassiodorus and Augustine focus. Gilbert paraphrases Alcuin's opinion (leaving out the lexical gloss), effectively emphasizing the deterrent effect of the threat of future punishment. When Gilbert glosses Psalm 6:2, he briefly reiterates Alcuin's position, this time without naming him.³¹

²⁸ *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Expositio Psalmi CXVIII*, ed. M. Petschenig (Vienna, 1913) CSEL 62 part 6 (repr. 1962 as vol. 5); *Explanatio in Psalmorum XII*, ed. Petschenig (Vienna, 1919) CSEL 64 part 6 (repr. 1962 as vol. 6).

²⁹ PL 100:569–638. Migne reprints the 1669 d'Achery editions with emendation from manuscripts from St. Emmeram and the cathedral library of Salzburg. F. Stegmüller lists only two extant manuscripts: Wilhering .IX,121 (12c) comprising the penitential psalms, and Paris B.N. lat. 2384, containing the gradual psalms.

³⁰ Alcuin, PL 100:575. Alcuin briefly repeats himself at Psalm 37:2, which has the identical text; PL 100:579.

³¹ Gilbert, Ps 2:5, Paris B.N. lat. 12004 fol. 3r; Ps 6:2, fol. 7r.

Alcuin, Ps 6:2: "Ira est longa indignatio; furor vero repentina mentis accensio; sed ira aeternum impiorum significat poenam, furor ignem purgatorium . . ."

Gilbert, Ps 2:5: "Vel minatur de futuro iudicio, ita: *qui habitat in celis*, idest dominus, scilicet potens, *irridebit et subsannabit eos*, idest irrisione dignos reddet in futuro. Que planius supponit, *tunc*, idest in futuro, qui modo cum non punit, videtur tacere, *loquetur in ira sua et in furore suo*, idest eterna pena. Ira et furor dei, vis est in ipso, qua iuste iudicat . . . Vel divide: *loquetur hic in ira*, idest in comminatione pene; et in futuro, *conturbabit eos in furore suo*, idest eterna pena." At Ps 6:2: ". . . per quodlibet autem, futurum iudicium accipitur."

Alcuin appears to provide alternative glosses for Gilbert on other rare occasions, without benefit of marginal indications, for example at Psalm 31:1.³² Alcuin is named in the margins as Gilbert's source in four other psalms (namely, Psalms 53, 54, 61 and 87); as was the case with Psalm 2, none of these is among the seven penitential and fifteen gradual psalms which Alcuin actually expounded. This eccentric and sporadic representation of Alcuin suggests that Gilbert did not have the *Enchiridion* on hand—manuscripts containing this work seem to have been very rare³³—but probably relied instead on an unidentified later *florilegium* containing individual glosses by Alcuin.

Somewhat surprisingly, there is only a single marginal reference to Haimo, which also occurs in the commentary on Psalm 2.³⁴ Unfortunately, this reference will have to go unverified for the moment; the Psalms commentary attributed to "Haymo of Halberstadt" in the

³² Gilbert: "Vel iniquitates dicit que sunt ante baptismum; peccata, que post"; B.N. lat 12004, fol. 38r. Alcuin: "Iniquitates quidam appellant, quae ante baptismum fiunt; peccata, quae postea perpetrantur"; *PL* 100:577. Gilbert's marginalia actually notes "Ier" here; Jerome does not have a homily or treatise on Psalm 31, but Cassiodorus, in his own commentary for Psalm 31, does cite Jerome to this effect, and this is very likely Gilbert's source for the idea (cf. *In Oseam* 8, 13/14: *PL* 25:889; see *Ex. Ps.*, *CCSL* 79, 276n). However this may be, Gilbert's wording is by far closest to Alcuin's.

³³ See note 29 above.

³⁴ Gilbert, Ps 2:2,3: "*Convenerunt*, dicentes, *disrumpamus vincula*, id est rationes *eorum*, id est Dei et Christi, vel Christi et discipulorum; et *proiciamus a nobis iugum* id est legem *ipsorum*, christianam scilicet religionem." B.N. lat. 12004 fol. 3r. Cassiodorus has "Christ and His disciples" as the subject of "*eorum*", and Augustine supplies "christian religion" for "*iugum*"; the rest is apparently Haimo's contribution.

Patrologia has long been known to be the work of neither that ninth-century bishop nor of Haimo of Auxerre. Haimo of Auxerre certainly commented on the Psalms among many other books of the Bible, and fragments of commentary attributed in the manuscripts to "HAI", along with those of a certain "IOH" (presumably John Scotus), have been identified, but not yet published.³⁵ John Contreni, who has studied these glosses, stresses that they represent a compilation based on the teaching of these two Carolingian masters, in fact a sort of *reportatio*, not excerpts from complete commentaries. They are very lexically oriented, most being straightforward definitions of proper nouns and difficult words. The extreme rarity of the manuscripts does not suggest a wide distribution for the glosses, and as with the case of Alcuin one is disposed to think that Gilbert did not have this set of glosses at hand, but that certain glosses attributed to Haimo found their way into later compilations. At any rate, the glosses attributed to "Haimo" in Gilbert's marginal references do not appear in the "HAI" glosses in the Bern manuscript.

The last Carolingian on our list is, by contrast, fairly frequently represented in Gilbert's commentary. Explanations inspired by Remigius of Auxerre are indicated about 68 times by marginal references, both in the commentary proper and in the Prologue. When the indicated passages are compared to the commentary discussed and partially published by Vaccari,³⁶ Remigius emerges as a strong presence among Gilbert's sources. The first marginal reference to Remigius is at Psalm 1:3, and there is indeed in Remigius a striking parallel to Gilbert's comments, though, characteristically, it is not a verbatim transcription.³⁷

³⁵ Only two manuscripts contain the HAI glosses on the Psalms: Bern Burgerbibliothek 258 (early tenth century, possibly from Fleury, Orleans or Auxerre, but not Laon) and Paris B.N. lat. 1977 (ca. 1200). As early as 1895 F. Güterbock suggested Haimo of Auxerre and John Scotus as the referents of the initials: "Aus irischen Handschriften in Turin und Rom," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 33 (1985): 103–105; Contreni confirms this and suggests Heiric as the compiler of the two sets of glosses; J. Contreni, "The Biblical Glosses of Haimo of Auxerre and John Scotus Eriugena," *Speculum* (1974): 411–434. Thanks to John Contreni, I have been able to check Gilbert against the "Bern" Haimo. The two Haimos (Auxerre and Halberstadt) have been untangled by R. Quadri, "Aimone di Auxerre alla luce dei 'Collectanea' de Heiric de Auxerre," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 6 (1963): 1–48.

³⁶ Vaccari gives both the short ("Reims") and the more common longer ("Rome") redactions of the preface and of Psalms 1, 29 and 63; he also includes fragments of Remigius' glosses to other psalms which are cited by other medieval commentators (Vaccari did not include Gilbert in his study).

³⁷ Gilbert, Psalm 1:3; B.N. lat. 12004, fol. 1v. Remigius, longer redaction; Vaccari, 71.

Gilbert: "Vel per aquam, mortale genus accipitur, unde Iohannes: *aquae multae populi multi* [cf. Apoc 17:15] horum decursus, lapsus per quem defluunt in mortem, sicut aqua in mare. Secundum hoc etiam Christus homo, non in decursus, sed *secus decursus*, quia Christus non caro peccati factus est, sed in similitudinem carnis peccati [Rom 8:3]."

Remigius: "Aquae autem multae populi sunt multi. Aquae quippe natura est ut a superioribus ad inferiora dilabatur. Sic et humanum genus semper ab exordio vitae usque ad mortem tendit, et Christus iuxta aquas quodammodo plantatus fuit, qui in similitudine carnis peccati apparens ad mortem sicut ceteri homines tetendit."

This passage is only the latter part of a long *distinctio* by which Remigius introduces the subject of water. His first and second distinctions (water equals the Holy Spirit, water equals Divine Wisdom) Remigius may have taken from Augustine; the third distinction, that water represents mortal human nature, is not to be found in Jerome, Augustine or Cassiodorus.³⁸ Gilbert takes over all three of Remigius's significations, but in different order, and he suppresses the allusion to the Incarnation which Remigius incorporates into the first *distinctio*, which refers to the Holy Spirit.³⁹ He follows Remigius the closest when he reports on the third *distinctio*. Gilbert gives credit to Augustine as well as to Remigius for the first two distinctions, but he also includes passages of Scripture cited in support of Augustine's "Holy Spirit" distinction which Augustine himself does not supply, but which Remigius does.⁴⁰

Besides the very particular parallels between Gilbert and Remigius on Ps 1:3, there are other minor points of contact throughout the rest of this psalm. Woven into the patristic fabric of the commentary are phrases and ideas not to be found in Cassiodorus or Augustine, but which are featured in Remigius.

Psalm 1:1⁴¹

Gilbert: "Adam *abiit* a Deo, non loco, sed animi cogitatione, cum *consilio impiorum*, idest suggestioni serpentis et

Remigius: "Adam, in *consilio impiorum abiit*, cum diabolo suadenti assensum praebuit; *in via peccatorum stetit*, cum

³⁸ Jerome compares the tree planted beside running water (not the water itself) to Wisdom, and mentions Solomon (citing Prov 3:18) 1:96–118; like Jerome, Remigius mentions Solomon, but cites a different Scripture (Prov 18:4).

³⁹ Interestingly, it is precisely this distinction in Remigius which seems to fuel the Mariolatry of the Pseudo-Remigian gloss on Ps 1:3; *PL* 131:152.

⁴⁰ The passage is John 7:37–39.

⁴¹ Gilbert, B.N. lat. 12004, fol. 1v; Remigius, Vaccari, 70; this section is found in the "Reims" version but not in the more common "Rome" version from which the

Eve voluntate consensit. Suggestio consilium dicitur, quoniam quasi ex ratione diabolus utile proposuit . . . *stetit*, delectatione in via peccatorum, dum pomum comedit. *Sedit*, consensu et quasi consuetudine cum in superbia confirmatus . . .”

“... *in via peccatorum* id est prava operatione . . .”

“... *die ac nocte*, id est assidue, vel in prosperis et adversis.”

pomum ligni vetiti gustavit; *in cathedra pestilentiae sedit*, cum ad peccandum per superbiam se obfirmavit.”

“Vel etiam *via peccatorum* est pravae actiones eorum.”

“... Vel in adversis et prosperis . . .”

There are other specific indications of influence. For example, both Gilbert and Remigius share with Cassiodorus the distinction between being “in the law” and being “under the law”, the former being the status of the *beatus vir* of verse one; but the further definition of “under the law” as serving out of fear, *ex timore*, rather than voluntarily, is not to be found in Cassiodorus or Augustine, but only in Remigius.⁴² Similarly, Gilbert compares the “tree planted beside running water” of verse three with the Tree of Life planted in Paradise, and thence makes the allegorical leap to the tree as Christ Incarnate planted in the midst of the Church on earth; this is unparalleled in Jerome, Augustine or Cassiodorus, but is exactly the same progression as in Remigius.⁴³ In addition, Gilbert cites Scripture texts not found in this place in his patristic sources, but provided by Remigius.⁴⁴ Other subtler hints of influence occur in shared vocabulary not echoed in the older sources, and ideas which Gilbert puts into his own words but which are inspired directly by Remigius.

For another acknowledged citation from Remigius we turn to Gilbert’s comments on the title to Psalm 8:1, which includes the phrase *pro torcularia*, “for the wine presses”.⁴⁵ This citation Gilbert presents

rest of Gilbert’s citations from Remigius seem to have been taken. Some of Gilbert’s phrases favor Cassiodorus’ wording here, but others are clearly Remigian.

⁴² Here again (see note 38 above) Remigius seems to draw upon Jerome: “Non dixit timor, sed voluntas; multi enim timore faciunt, sed timor facientis mercedem non habet”; 1:70–72. Gilbert follows Remigius’ wording, not Jerome’s.

⁴³ Jerome speaks of the Tree of Wisdom in Eden; Cassiodorus mentions the tree of the Cross; Augustine is more concerned about the running waters than about the tree.

⁴⁴ They both cite Galatians 4:4 and Matthew 24:35 regarding the lengthy verse three.

⁴⁵ This phrase is rendered in the RSV as “according to ‘the Gittith’”, possibly meaning that the Psalm was to be sung to a tune of that name: *New Oxford Annotated Bible* (New York, 1977), 656. See above, chapter 3, note 85.

as an optional gloss following the opinion of Augustine with which Gilbert begins and with which he later continues. Augustine's comments on this phrase are included here for comparison.⁴⁶

Gilbert, Ps 8:1: "Vel ideo etiam quia in ecclesia saepe per martyria, quasi per prementia torcularia, corpora bonorum in terris remanent, animae vero in requiem emanant."

Remigius: "Torcularia a torquendis uvis dicuntur, sicut prela a premendo. Torcularia significant martiria. Sicut in torculari uvae torquentur, ut proiectis acinis et gigardis suis purissimum et defecatum ex eis exprimatur vinum, sic sancti martires in Ecclesia diversis tribulationibus et passionibus torquentur ut acceptissimum ac defecatissimum vinum Deo fiant, quod in cellariis id est celestibus habitaculis recondatur."

Augustine: "Solent accipi torcularia etiam martyria . . . mortalia eorum tanquam vinacia in terra remanserint, animae autem in requiem caelestis habitationis emanerint . . .

Typically, Gilbert's abbreviation of his source tones down the colorful details of the simile, yet at the same time supplies concrete referents (body and soul) for Remigius' symbols (pulp and wine) even while suppressing the symbols themselves. Remigius' gloss is meant to convey much the same sentiment that Cassiodorus proposes in his own gloss of *torcular* as Ecclesia, which, through the sacrament of penance, puts "pressure on bodies" so that it might gather a "salutary harvest of souls".⁴⁷ Remigius' vocabulary suggests that he was inspired by Cassiodorus for this gloss, since they both use the unusual "*gigardis*" for the grape pulp and lavish other details of winemaking and cellaring, though their identification of the "pressing" is radically different (martyrdom in Remigius, penance in Cassiodorus). Gilbert's reading of Remigius, however, is influenced by Augustine, whose explanations dominate this section of Gilbert's commentary on Psalm 8; indeed, while keeping the Remigian gloss

⁴⁶ Gilbert, Ps 8:1, B.N. lat. 12004 fol. 9v. Remigius, Vaccari, 63. Augustine, *En. in Ps.* 8:3.1-4.

⁴⁷ Cassiodorus *Ex. Ps.*, 8:11-12. Trans. P. G. Walsh, 1990, p. 109.

of *torcularia* as a "pressing out" of the Church through martyrdom, Gilbert then explains that gloss in Augustinian phrases. The result is that the discarded lees (in Cassiodorus and Remigius, various impurities to be purged through penance or martyrdom, respectively) are identified by Gilbert, following Augustine, as the corporeal remains of the martyrs, left behind as the soul reaches eternal rest. Yet even while rejecting Remigius' definition of the lees in favor of Augustine's, Gilbert remains indebted to Remigius for the ecclesiological and martyriological bent of his gloss on the "wine press".⁴⁸

Further comparisons serve to reinforce the impression that Remigius' influence permeates Gilbert's Psalms commentary, strongly suggesting that Gilbert used the Remigian commentary as one of his base texts. While he relies on it perhaps less than he does on Augustine and Cassiodorus, he clearly regards it as more than a warehouse of optional glosses. As is evidenced by our look at Psalm 1, Remigian ideas and vocabulary percolate into the interstices of Gilbert's primarily Augustinian-Cassiodoran matrix, even more than the marginal references indicate.

The exact version of the Remigian commentary which Gilbert had at hand is uncertain. The reference which Gilbert apparently makes to the shorter "Reims" version of Remigius in Psalm 1:1,⁴⁹ and the brief but close excerpts from the older Carolingian masters Alcuin and Haimo, suggest that Gilbert may even have had an "improved" version of the Remigian commentary, one laced with relevant bits from other glosses of the time.⁵⁰ Alternatively, one could posit as Gilbert's source a heavily Remigian marginal/interlinear *glose perimée* influenced by the Auxerre school.⁵¹ This, however, is a less satisfying hypothesis, since it is difficult to imagine Gilbert so thoroughly integrating Remigius' thoughts from isolated glosses.

⁴⁸ Here Gilbert's commentary seems to be a source for the Pseudo-Remigius of *PL* 131. Gilbert uses Augustine and Remigius, who himself uses Cassiodorus: the resulting interpretation and vocabulary (including Gilbert's substitution of "*corpora*" for Augustine's "*mortalia*") finds its way into Ps-Remigius: *PL* 131:183. But this intriguing clue is for another study.

⁴⁹ See footnote 36 above.

⁵⁰ Note the several apparently extrapolated versions of Remigius' commentary listed by Vaccari, 87–92.

⁵¹ See Beryl Smalley, "Les commentaires bibliques de l'époque romane: glose ordinaire et gloses périmées," *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 4 (1961): 15–26 for discussion of such "obsolete" glosses in general. They are for the most part *sui generis* and have been little studied.

Other contemporary commentaries

The hypothesis that Gilbert made some use of one or more compilations of glosses from the Auxerre school prompts one to ask what use he might have made of other unacknowledged sources. In fact there are several commentaries which might reasonably be expected to have influenced Gilbert's Psalms commentary.

Gilbert's marginalia do not mention the very first source one might reasonably expect to encounter: there are no references to his master Anselm, nor to any dutifully reported *expositor* who might be Anselm, nor to any *glossa*—*parva*, *ordinaria*, or otherwise.⁵² If Gilbert relied on Anselm's marginal/interlinear gloss, he does not acknowledge it.⁵³ Among other names absent from Gilbert's marginalia are those of the *moderni*: Manegold, Lanfranc and Roscelin, for example, all wrote Psalms commentaries in the generation before Gilbert, but he appears not to have used them.⁵⁴ Other commentaries of the early to mid-twelfth century do cite recent and contemporary *magistri* by name on occasion, so certainly the precedent existed, and we shall suppose, for the moment, that Gilbert would have acknowledged these sources had he in fact used them.⁵⁵

Among published but pseudonymous Psalms commentaries, disarray still reigns over questions of dating and attribution. Some commentaries have found themselves in print more thanks to fortune and the whim of editors than to their intrinsic or relative merit, and the mere fact of their publication has disproportionately burdened them with consequence. In many cases the proposed dating depends on the flimsiest of attributions; the reverse is also true. Endeavors to

⁵² Robert of Melun quotes the *Glossa* on the Psalms as "expositor" in his *Quaestiones de Divina Pagina* (1142–7) as does Peter Lombard in his *Sentences* (1152). See Beryl Smalley, "Gilbertus Universalis, Bishop of London, and the Problem of the 'Glossa Ordinaria,'" 45. Robert of Bridlington, writing his Epistles commentary towards 1150, cites the *Glossa* as "Anselm". Smalley, "La *Glossa Ordinaria*, quelques prédécesseurs d'Anselme de Laon," *RTAM* 9 (1937): 367.

⁵³ This question will be addressed at length in chapter 5.

⁵⁴ For medieval testimonies to the existence of a (now lost) Psalms commentary written by Manegold, see discussion of Ps-Bede below. For two fragments believed to be excerpts from Lanfranc's otherwise lost Psalms commentary, included by Herbert in his "edition" of Peter Lombard's commentary, see Smalley, "La *Glossa Ordinaria*," 374.

⁵⁵ For example, the glosses on the Pauline Epistles attributed to "school of Lanfranc" in MS Paris B.N. lat. 12267 (early twelfth century) which cites "Lanfranc" as well as "Augustinus" and "Ambrose", and MS Vatican lat. 143 (early-mid twelfth century) which cites, in addition, "Berengar" and "Drogo"; Smalley, "La *Glossa Ordinaria*," 379, 384.

secure even relative dates for many of the commentaries have resulted in a Gordian knot of tautological arguments concerning the "first" appearance of significant phrases or ideas, and "abbreviations" (or "expansions") of one commentator by another.⁵⁶ Having established through external means that in all likelihood Gilbert wrote his commentary on the Psalms around 1117,⁵⁷ we are in a more comfortable position when it comes to comparing his work to these other Psalms commentaries. The following brief survey does not pretend to be definitive; we will make no attempt to disentangle the interrelations of all these commentaries. Still, we should be able to summarize the current scholarly opinion concerning them, in order to determine whether Gilbert might have used them in composing his own commentary.

Allegedly the oldest of the commentaries proposed as a source for Gilbert is that attributed to Bede in volume 93 of the *Patrologia*, but known since 1894 to be an amalgam of two earlier and one much later commentaries: the brief "arguments" are derived from the Psalms commentary by Theodore of Mopsuestia, the slightly longer "explanations" are taken nearly word for word from Cassiodorus, and the "commentary" which follows them is a work certainly no earlier than the late eleventh century, and perhaps considerably later. Found together in manuscripts from the ninth century, the "arguments" and "explanations" may indeed have been compiled by Bede; they are attributed to him as early as 75 years after his death in 735. The "commentary" was only appended to the other two parts on the occasion of the first printing in 1563.⁵⁸ We may disregard the compilation attributed to Bede (the arguments and explanations); in these areas Gilbert clearly relies directly on Cassiodorus for his material, since frequently he includes material which the alleged Bede omits. The Pseudo-Bede "commentary" on the other hand was attributed by G. Morin, in 1911, to Manegold of Lautenbach on the basis of style, citation of profane authors such as Macrobius and Horace, interest in issues related to the Investiture Controversy and allegedly

⁵⁶ An eloquent warning of the pitfalls inherent in such analyses is given by H. Barré, *Les homéliaires carolingiens de l'école d'Auxerre, Studi et Testi* (Vatican, 1962), 6.

⁵⁷ Not in 1125 or 1135; see above, chap. 2 pp. 26–34.

⁵⁸ H. Weisweiler, "Die handschriftlichen Vorlagen zum Erstdruck von Pseudo-Beda, *In Psalmonum Librum Exegesis*," *Biblica* 18 (1937): 197–204a. G. Morin, "Le Pseudo-Bède sur les Psaumes, et l'*Opus super Psalterium* de Maître Manegold de Lautenbach," *Revue Bénédictine* 28 (1911): 331–340.

French bias.⁵⁹ As tantalizing as was the prospect of recovering a major lost work by the enigmatic Manegold, the attribution did not rest unchallenged.⁶⁰ Defended valiantly for sixty years,⁶¹ Morin's thesis finally has been discredited, and the commentary is now generally admitted to be anonymous, from the first half of the twelfth century.⁶² The manuscript tradition discourages too the idea that the Pseudo-Bede's commentary could have influenced Gilbert, since the five extant twelfth-century manuscripts are all from southeast Germany and Austria.⁶³ It is Hartmann's contention that the genuine commentary of Manegold of Lautenbach hardly circulated beyond his fellow Augustinians, and that it lacked an audience because it wavered between a too-hearty interest in wordly knowledge and a too-mystical surrender to the ineffable Word.⁶⁴

There are occasional parallel phrases which suggest some sort of

⁵⁹ Morin, *ibid.* He points out that the earlier suggestion that the commentary is by Ambrosius Autpertus runs into the difficulty that Autpertus used the so-called Roman Psalter, and Ps-Bede the Gallican. That Manegold did write a Psalm commentary is attested by at least four twelfth-century witnesses: twelfth-century catalogues and lists from St-Martial in Limoges, St-Allyre in Clermont-Ferrand, and Wolfger von Prüfening; also, a series of glosses in an extant manuscript (London British Museum Royal 3B XI, ca. 1200) names a "Monogaldus" as a source. In addition, Henry of Brussels (ob. after 1270) notes a Psalms commentary by (a) "Manegold". See Wilfried Hartmann, "Psalmen-kommentare aus der Zeit der Reform und der Frühscholastik," *Studi Gregoriani* 9 (1972): 319–320, 324–5, 327.

⁶⁰ Damian Van den Eynde, "Literary Note on the Earliest Scholastic *Commentarii in Psalmos*," *Franciscan Studies* 14 (1954): 122, 140. This is the first of two articles devoted to overturning the then-accepted dating of a handful of commentaries, resulting in the reassignment of all of them to the second quarter of the twelfth century. His results have been widely but not universally accepted.

⁶¹ Morin's attribution was supported by H. Weisweiler, "Die handschriftlichen Vorlagen zum Erstdruck von Pseudo-Beda, In *Psalmorum Librum Exegesis*," *Biblica* 18 (1937); Lottin, *Psychologie et Morale* 5:146–153; V. I. J. Flint, who notes the weak spots in Van den Eynde's arguments, "Some Notes on the Early Twelfth Century Commentaries on the Psalms," *RTAM* 38 (1971): 80–88.

⁶² W. Hartmann definitively deprived Manegold of authorship of the Ps-Bede commentary, even while rejecting many of Van den Eynde's arguments; "Psalmen-kommentare aus der Zeit der Reform." He also corrects a codicological error by Weisweiler (see note above), which had erroneously suggested a pre-1100 date for the commentary.

⁶³ Hartmann points this out as evidence against an identification of Ps-Bede with Manegold, whose commentary, according to twelfth-century references to it, seems to have circulated in France; "Psalmenkommentare aus der Zeit der Reform," 324. For list of manuscripts, F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium biblicum Medii Aevi* (Madrid, 1940–1979), vol. 3.

⁶⁴ Hartmann, "Psalmenkommentare aus der Zeit der Reform," 356–360, 366. However, see note 82 below for a possible connection between Ps-Bede and Manegold after all.

relationship between the Pseudo-Bede commentary and that of Gilbert, most notably in their prologues. For example, in his discussion of prophecy Pseudo-Bede mentions "Sibyl the soothsayer and the infidel philosophers", as does Gilbert.⁶⁵ But whereas Gilbert remarks only that prophecy can proceed from both good and evil individuals ("*in bonis et in malis*"), Pseudo-Bede specifies that such prophecies are "by grace" in the case of good persons such as Moses and "by permission" in the case of the irreligious or impious.⁶⁶ This and other precisions, one might even say improvements, on the occasional Gilbertine parallel point strongly to the conclusion that Pseudo-Bede, whoever he was, had access to Gilbert's work. On the other hand, the extreme scarcity of such borrowings indicates that Pseudo-Bede did not rely much on Gilbert's commentary. It is possible that he used instead Gilbert's Prologue (we have seen that it had an independant circulation) and perhaps one of the commentaries heavily influenced by Gilbert (such as the "edited" versions in Valenciennes and Oxford).⁶⁷

Another Psalms commentary which appears to date from the first quarter of the century is that attributed to Honorius Augustodunensis and only partially published.⁶⁸ Honorius' commentary is provisionally dated to 1115–1120; he died ca. 1156.⁶⁹ For those who accepted the unsubstantiated later date (ca. 1130) for Gilbert's commentary, Honorius would seem to have had the honor of being a contributor to Gilbert's work, for there are many passages which seem to parallel each other. However, V. I. J. Flint has made the important observation that Honorius' *Expositio* was little utilized by later commentators, and that in fact there are only six twelfth-century manuscripts

⁶⁵ See discussion of this passage in chap. three, p. 88.

⁶⁶ Ps-Bede, *PL* 93:480. See also Van den Eynde, "Literary Note," 142–144.

⁶⁷ MSS Valenciennes B.M. 40, 42, 43, comprising a twelfth-century commentary from St-Amand; Oxford Bodleian Auct. D.2.1 from Lanthony, and Auct. D.4.6, from Reading, both marginal/interlinear glosses (the latter closer to Gilbert than the former), twelfth century; see Nikolaus M. Häring, "Handschriftliches zu den Werken Gilberts Bischof von Poitiers," 171, 186–187; he mistakenly gives the Valenciennes MSS to Gilbert.

⁶⁸ The comments for Psalms 1, 50, 51, 100 and 101 as well as the letter of dedication, prologue and an epilogue in *PL* 172:269–312. The comments for Psalms 31–37 and 78–117 are published along with the commentary by Gerhoch of Reichersberg in *Thesaurus Anecdotorum novissimus*, ed. Pez (Augsburg, 1719–1728), vol. 5.

⁶⁹ For the proposed dates (there is no hard evidence), H. Menhardt, "Der Nachlass des Honorius Augustodunensis," *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 89 (1958): 69.

of the *Expositio*, all with a provenance of far southeastern Germany (near Regensburg, in fact) and Austria.⁷⁰ This makes it very unlikely that Gilbert would have had access to an exemplar in time to compose his own commentary.

It is somewhat more likely that Honorius swiftly obtained a copy of Gilbert's commentary, whose popularity gave it wings.⁷¹ But a careful comparison of the two commentaries suggests that no such relay need be imagined, for the similarities can be explained simply by the fact that Gilbert and Honorius used many of the same sources. In Psalm 1, for example, Honorius uses Jerome, Augustine, Cassiodorus and Remigius, but often includes material not used by Gilbert from these sources (Honorius is very prolix) and does not repeat Gilbert's paraphrasing. V. I. J. Flint has noted in addition that Honorius includes passages derived from Gregory, for example, which also appear in some printed versions of the *Glossa ordinaria*;⁷² they are not, however, in Gilbert. A closer look at all three commentaries might yield confirmation that Honorius did rely on the *Glossa* (or that the final version of the *Glossa* benefitted from Honorius' *Expositio*); but it does not look like Honorius used Gilbert's commentary, and we may dismiss any likelihood that Gilbert used his.

There has been much written over whether or not the Psalms commentary printed in *Patrologia latina* volume 152 is really by Bruno, founder of the Carthusian order.⁷³ Whether it was written by Bruno while at Chartreuse (1076–1101), or by Pseudo-Bruno ca. 1150, it

⁷⁰ Flint, "Some Notes," 88.

⁷¹ R. W. Southern reports that Honorius travelled extensively in search of material for his own writings: *St. Anselm and his Biographer* (Cambridge, 1963) 209–217.

⁷² Flint, "Some Notes," 82; she uses *Biblia sacra cum Glossa ordinaria*, (Antwerp, 1617); the citations in question do not appear in the Rusch reprint nor in *PL* 100.

⁷³ Joseph Geiselmann, "Der Abendmahlsbrief des Anselm von Canterbury ein Werk des Anselm von Laon," *Theologische Quartalschrift* 3 (1930): the commentary is Bruno's, written in Reims where he taught 1056–1076; this view is now rejected. A. Landgraf, "Probleme des Schrifttums Brunos der Kartäuser," *Collectanea Franciscana* (1938): 577: it is Bruno's, but written at the Grande Chartreuse monastery. Van den Eynde, "Complementary Notes on the Early Scholastic *Commentarii in Psalmos*," *Franciscan Studies* 17 (1957): it is Pseudo-Bruno and postdates (but does not use) Gilbert. A. Stoelen, "Les commentaires scripturaires attribués à Bruno le Chartreux," *RTAM* 25 (1958): it is late eleventh- early twelfth-century by style and content, and thus could be Bruno's. Hartmann, "Psalmenkommentare," accepts Van den Eynde (*i.e.* not by Bruno). J. Châtillon, "La Bible dans les écoles du XII^e siècle," in *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, ed. P. Riché and G. Lobrichon (Paris, 1984), 172: avers that the attribution to Bruno is "generally accepted" but does not press the point (and adds that it was likely composed while Bruno was in Reims).

could hardly have been an influence on Gilbert: there is only a single known exemplar of this commentary, and it was in Chartreuse in the twelfth century.⁷⁴ However, there are some details which suggest that the author of the commentary had access to Gilbert. As one example, Gilbert's paraphrase of Alcuin in Psalm 2:4 is picked up verbatim by the alleged Bruno.⁷⁵ Further investigation might reveal that the disputed commentary in *PL* 152 does rely on Gilbert, which would definitively revoke it from Bruno's authorship.

A major contender for attention among near contemporary commentaries is the one once attributed to Rufinus, but since 1914 rightly restored to its genuine author, Letbert of Lille, abbot of the Augustinian house of St. Ruf in Avignon from 1100 to 1110.⁷⁶ Fifteen years after Letbert's death, the admiring bishop Walter of Maguelonne, who had been Letbert's successor as abbot, had the commentary copied. He presented it to the chapter of Letbert's native city of Lille, where Letbert had been a canon, and from where it exerted an extraordinary influence: Stegmüller lists twenty-eight manuscripts, at least ten of which date from the twelfth century, plus another ten now lost.⁷⁷

Letbert's commentary is of particular importance to us because unlike most of the commentaries we have been dealing with, instead of having no fixed dates at all, it has two. Letbert wrote it, obviously, before his death in 1110 (and therefore could not have used either Gilbert or the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms) but it was not circulated outside of St. Ruf until 1125. An indubitable borrowing from Letbert by Gilbert would push Gilbert's commentary forward to the 1125–1130 range, but such is not the case; it is almost uncanny how the two commentaries have managed completely to avoid even borrowing the same patristic explanations.

There is one thing Letbert's commentary has in common with Gilbert's, and that is the use of *accessus* terminology in the last part of Letbert's Preface and in the explanations of the titles which preface each psalm. In the latter, Letbert's commentary briefly notes the *materia* and *intentio* indicated by the title; but despite the use of the

⁷⁴ MS Grenoble Bibl. Munic. 240, 12th century, provenance Grande Chartreuse.

⁷⁵ Gilbert: "... id est, irrisione dignos in futuro." Paris B.N. lat. 12004 fol. 3r. Ps-Bruno: "... id est in futuro dignos irrisione fuisse ostendet." *PL* 152:645.

⁷⁶ A. Wilmart, "Le Commentaire sur les Psaumes imprimé sous le nom de Rufin," *Renue bénédictine* 31 (1914-19): 258-276.

⁷⁷ Stegmüller *Repertorium Biblicum* vol. 3.

two academic terms, the explanations of the titles are entirely dissimilar to the miniature *accessus* Gilbert provides for each psalm. Also unlike Gilbert's introductions, they do not merge with the body of the commentary, mapping out the program which the exegesis will follow; rather they remain quite unconnected to what follows.⁷⁸

The Preface to Letbert's commentary is also, in fact, very peculiar. It is made up of two distinct parts: roughly the first half is nothing more or less than a verbatim transcription from the last quarter of Hilary's prologue to his Psalms commentary.⁷⁹ The second half is a pastiche of definitions plus some not very well-integrated *accessus* terms. Halfway through this section, the commentator introduces the *materia* for the first time,⁸⁰ then admits that some might ask "to what part of philosophy" the Psalms belonged (answer: that which treats of morals belongs to ethics; that which deals with nature, to physics). *Modus* and *intentio* follow shortly, and the prologue ends abruptly. The early date of Letbert's commentary and the unconvincing manner in which the *accessus* items are pasted together suggests that the exemplum presented by Walter of Maguelonne to the chapter of Lille was actually an updated edition of Letbert's (lost) holograph, embellished with added introductory material and "modern" *accessus* argot.⁸¹ At any rate, it is clear that we do not have to consider Letbert or the pasted-on Preface as a source for Gilbert.

The Psalms commentary printed under the name of Haymo of Halberstadt in *Patrologia latina* 116 is the last of the pseudonymous commentaries to command our attention. Though manuscripts of the

⁷⁸ An excellent illustration of this is in the miniature *accessus* with which Gilbert prefaces Psalm 8. In the final sentence of the *accessus*, he segues right from a paraphrase of Augustine into his own statement of the indexed subject of the psalm: "*Pro torcularibus* ergo, id est pro ecclesiis constituendis, psallitur in finem, id est in Christum, de cuius exaltatione secundum utramque naturam, hic est psalmus secundus." Paris B.N. lat. 12004 fol. 9v.

⁷⁹ Hilary, *Tractatus* Instr. ps. c.17.2-c.24.

⁸⁰ The commentator severely abbreviates Cassiodorus' tripartite formula to read "Communis materia totius huius operis, Christus est, tripliciter acceptus: id est, secundum divinitatem, secundum humanitatem, et secundum corpus eius, quod est Ecclesia." Compare Cassiodorus *Ex. Ps. praef.* 13:1-22.

⁸¹ This was frequently done for profane commentaries (see chapter three, n. 31). The holograph copy of Letbert's commentary does not exist, so this speculation cannot be proven absolutely. The first edition (Lyons, 1570) was from a manuscript from the destroyed library of an ancient monastery situated on the Ile Barbe (in the Saône, north of Lyons) according to its editor de Albane: "Notitia" in *PL* 21:19. It is not mentioned in Stegmüller, nor is there any indication of its date; it is certainly not the "original" either.

commentary are scarce, it has enjoyed perhaps disproportionate attention since Erasmus first found it worthy of publication.⁸² Since the beginning of this century, most of the works spuriously attributed to this ninth-century bishop have been reassigned to his namesake and younger contemporary, Haimo of Auxerre—except for this Psalms commentary, which surely belonged to neither.⁸³ As early as 1890, Albert Hauck had noticed that a reference to “Guibertus demens” (Wibert of Ravenna, the antipope Clement III, ob.1100) and to the Guibertine stronghold known as the “turris Crescentii” (Castel Sant’Angelo, Hadrian’s tomb in Rome) dated the commentary to a time subsequent to the violent events of that schism.⁸⁴

In 1936, Dom Wilmart, mindful of Hauck’s discovery, was inspired to assign the commentary to Anselm of Laon on the basis of the rubric of a newly-discovered manuscript.⁸⁵ This attribution has been challenged more or less fiercely ever since, scholars having pointed out that the rubric is unique in the manuscript tradition, that there is no record of any such a continuous commentary by Anselm, and that in spite of showing occasional close ties with the *Glossa ordinaria* attributed to Anselm, the Pseudo-Haimo commentary blatantly contradicts it in other places.⁸⁶ W. Hartmann in particular was effective

⁸² Stegmüller lists four manuscripts plus two small fragments. He omits two items noted by Wilmart: a Bodleian manuscript (probably on the grounds of its “considerable interpolations”), and a fragment (Einsiedeln 175) in which Ps-Haimo provides the commentary for the last four and a half psalms; for the first 145-plus psalms, the commentary is that of Ps-Bede. The manuscript used by Erasmus was in the Augustinian abbey of Marbach in Alsace, and is not extant (*PL* 116:191–194). The Ps-Haimo/Robert of Bridlington/Augustinian/Manegold connection proposed by Hartmann could well include Ps-Bede after all; see note 64 above.

⁸³ In 1492 Trithemius, Abbot of Spanheim, identified this group of writings as Haimo of Halberstadt’s (bishop 841–853) and the identification stood for some four hundred years. E. Riggenbach finally proved that they belonged, for the most part, to Haimo, monk and magister of Auxerre (fl. 840s–860s); “Die ältesten lateinischen Kommentare zum Hebräerbrief,” *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* . . . 8, no. 1 (1907); cited in A. Wilmart, “Un commentaire des Psaumes restitué à Anselme de Laon,” *RTAM* 3 (1936): 1.

⁸⁴ A riveting account, complete with supporting texts, given by Wilmart, *ibid.*, 328–335, who credits A. Hauck with noting the references: *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* 2 (1890) 597ff.; 3 (1906) 865ff., 1043ff.

⁸⁵ MS Vatican Reg. Lat. 295; it belonged in the fifteenth century to the Celestines of Marcoussis, near Limours (southwest of Paris); Wilmart, *ibid.*, 338. Erasmus had named “Haymo, monk, abbot and bishop” as author in his 1561 edition, but as Wilmart pointed out, this is no guarantee that the author was thus named in the (lost) Marbach manuscript.

⁸⁶ A. M. Landgraf, “Die Zuweisung eines Psalmenkommentars an Anselm von Laon,” *Biblica* 23 (1942): 170–174; van den Eynde, “Literary Note,” 132–139;

in pointing out the “slavish” and somewhat eclectic plagiarism of the Pseudo-Haimo, accounting for the commentary’s unsettling combination of anachronism and nascent scholasticism.⁸⁷ Hartmann also pointed out the close connections between Pseudo-Haimo and Pseudo-Bede,⁸⁸ and in fact the same relationship to Gilbert applies in both cases. Pseudo-Haimo relies heavily on Gilbert’s *accessus* Prologue, but the body of his commentary is almost entirely dissimilar.⁸⁹ If Anselm were really the author of the commentary, one would expect his student Gilbert to have been more influenced by it; on the contrary, we know that Gilbert’s Prologue was quickly affixed even to entirely unrelated commentaries and glosses on the Psalms, so its influence was not tied to the popularity and circulation of Gilbert’s commentary *per se*.

Gilbert’s profound reliance on his acknowledged sources, as established earlier in this chapter, provides us with valuable corroboration for the current (but not entirely uncontested)⁹⁰ scholarly opinion concerning the possible relationship of Gilbert’s commentary to these pseudonymous, near-contemporary commentaries. However, one can take a certain cold comfort in the observation that if one were to eliminate from Gilbert’s commentary all of his original paraphrases and recombinations of Augustine, Cassiodorus, Jerome and Remigius,

O. Lottin, *Psychologie et Morale* 5:170–175; Hartmann, “Psalmenkommentare aus der Zeit der Reform,” 346–354. Beryl Smalley had been convinced by Wilmart, but by 1983 conceded that the attribution was far from certain; *Study*, 67n; Preface to third edition, p. x; V. I. J. Flint noted some weaknesses in van den Eynde’s arguments, and voted in favor of Wilmart’s attribution for want of a better reason not to (she did not have the benefit of Hartmann’s article); “Some Notes,” 80–88. J. Châtillon testifies that the attempted attribution is today rejected, “La Bible dans les écoles,” 176.

⁸⁷ Hartmann, “Psalmenkommentare aus der Zeit der Reform,” 353. See also Van den Eynde, “Literary Note,” 135.

⁸⁸ For example, their discussion of “Sybil the soothsayer and the infidel philosophers” and prophecy “by grace” and “by permission” is nearly verbatim; *PL* 93:479, *PL* 116:195.

⁸⁹ Ps-Haimo also shows some kinship with Letbert, at least in the prologue; both, for instance, announce “Communis materia totius huius operis, Christus est tripliciter acceptus; i.e., secundum deitatem, secundum humanitatem, et secundum corpus [eius, quod est Ecclesia];” the final phrase, specified in Cassiodorus from whom this is paraphrased, is omitted by Ps-Haimo. Not knowing the date of Ps-Haimo, it is difficult to say whether he borrowed from Letbert or Letbert (rather, Walter of Maguelonne) from Ps-Haimo.

⁹⁰ The dates (and therefore the possible relationships to Gilbert) for the commentaries by Pseudo-Haimo and the possibly-Pseudo-Bruno are still contested; see J. Châtillon, “La Bible dans les écoles,” 172; V. I. J. Flint, “Some Notes”.

there would be very little raw material left to credit to any uncredited sources. Out of the few passages in Gilbert which are not derived from one of his acknowledged sources, I have noticed none which seems to owe its origin to any of these pseudonymous commentaries.

Gilbert's return to the great Patristic commentators and to Remigius for the inspiration and the fabric of his commentary illustrates his commitment to the firsthand study of authoritative sources. It also inevitably raises questions about the relationship of Gilbert's commentary to the *Glossa ordinaria*, which shall be addressed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

GILBERT AND THE *GLOSSA ORDINARIA*

The recognition of Gilbert's profound, direct and acknowledged debt to Augustine and Cassiodorus, and to a lesser extent to Jerome and Remigius, urges us to reconsider the long-oversimplified appraisal of the relationship between Gilbert's commentary and the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms.¹ Modern scholars, having taken note of the many textual parallels between the two commentaries, and heeding a few remarks by later medieval exegetes, almost universally dismiss Gilbert's commentary as little more than the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms couched in continuous prose.

The tradition that Gilbert's commentary was an amplification of the *Glossa ordinaria* goes back to the Middle Ages. Frequently cited to confirm this opinion are two thirteenth-century marginal additions to the chronicle of Robert of Auxerre (ob. 1212). The first is retrospectively entered under the year 1138–1139: “[In these days] Gilbert, the distinguished doctor, shone . . . he quite usefully edited master Anselm's little gloss on the Psalter and on the Epistles of Paul, which was put together out of the sayings of the holy Fathers.” A second thirteenth-century hand adds to the same chronicle, under the year 1152: “The little gloss on the Psalter and on the Epistles of Paul, adorned by Anselm with marginal and interlinear glosses, then extended in continuous fashion by Gilbert, was fully and clearly expounded

¹ This question was raised briefly in chapter four. For this study I have relied on *Biblia latina cum glossa ordinaria: Anastatical Reproduction of the First Printed Edition, Strassburg, c.1480*, ed. K. Froehlich and M. T. Gibson (Louvain, 1991) vol. 5, Psalms. It has the advantage, now, of availability, but it is only an approximation of the “original” text. It now happily supercedes the edition offered by Migne in *PL* 113, which is nearly useless, as it only includes the marginal glosses, and those erratically. Whatever Strabo's contribution to the *Glossa* on other books of the Bible, he is certainly not responsible for that on the Psalms; in addition, it is clear that the marginal and interlinear glosses are so designated purely according to length and convenience of placement, not because of differing authors or types of exposition, as was once believed. See K. Froehlich and M. T. Gibson in the Introduction to the Rusch edition; Margaret Gibson, “The Place of the *Glossa Ordinaria* in Medieval Exegesis,” *Ad Litteram: Authoritative texts and their Medieval Readers*, ed. Mark D. Jordan and Kent Emery, Jr. (Notre Dame, 1992); J. de Ghellinck, *Mouvement Théologique du XII^e siècle*, 2nd ed. (Bruges, 1948), 104–112; Smalley, *Study*, Preface (3d edition) x–xi, 56–60.

by [Peter Lombard].”² These anonymous notations testify that Gilbert “edited”, “expanded” and made “continuous” Anselm’s “little marginal/interlinear” gloss on the Psalms. By the time these descriptions appear, it must be admitted, the *Glossa* on the Psalms, already a century old, had become a fixture in the university of Paris and elsewhere; and Anselm, long dead, had been accorded nearly legendary status.

It is rare to find concessions by modern scholars that the situation might be more complex than these entries suggest. In his evaluation of Gilbert’s life and works, van Elswijk observes that “without a better understanding of the *Glossa ordinaria*, it is not possible exactly to determine the relations between the two glosses” and suggests that a thorough study of Gilbert might even shed light on the origins of the *Glossa*.³ More recently, Beryl Smalley revised her earlier opinion and noted that “we still need an estimate of Gilbert of Poitiers’ contribution in his *Media glosatura* on the Psalter, which came between Anselm’s *Parva* and the Lombard’s *Magna glosatura*. A glance at Gilbert on the Psalter in manuscript convinced me that he did much more than merely amplify the *parva glosatura*.”⁴

Two considerations support the informed intuitions of van Elswijk and Smalley, and subvert the notion that Gilbert merely expanded the *Glossa* on the Psalms. The first is the virtually complete textual independence of Gilbert’s commentary from the *Glossa*. This statement may appear surprising in view of the ubiquitously reported textual parallels between Gilbert’s commentary and the *Glossa*. But we have seen that Gilbert relied extensively on his acknowledged primary sources, especially on Augustine and Cassiodorus, somewhat less on Jerome and Remigius. Whatever guidance Gilbert may ultimately have had from Anselm, an attentive reading confirms that his

² *Chronicon*: “Clarebat Gislebertus doctor eximius . . . Hic post magistrum Anselmum super psalterium et super epistolas pauli ex dictis sanctorum patrum compactam utilem satis edidit glosaturam.” “Hic etiam [Petrus Lombardus] glosaturam super psalterium et epistolas Pauli ab Anselmo per glosulas interlineares marginalesque distinctam, post a Gisleberto continuative productam, latius apertius explicuit.” *MGH SS* 26:234, 237; cited by B. Smalley, “Gilbertus Universalis, Bishop of London, and the Problem of the ‘Glossa Ordinaria’,” pt. 2 *RTAM* 8 (1936): 31.

³ *Gilbert Porreta*, 47; in his earlier article, he had reiterated the usual view: “Gilbert Porreta als glosator van het psalterium,” in *Jubileumbundel voor G. P. Kreling, O. P.* (Nijmegen, 1953), 292.

⁴ Smalley, *Study*, Preface to 3d edition (1983), xi. The unchanged text of the third edition preserves her earlier estimation: “Gilbert . . . made an expansion of the patristic glosses in Anselm’s Gloss . . .” p. 64.

commentary had to have developed directly out of his integral sources, and that it would have been patently impossible for Gilbert to have arrived at his well integrated, programmatic patristic-Carolingian synthesis from the strings of extracts which make up the *Glossa ordinaria*. There are instances where a paraphrase of Augustine, for example, is rendered identically in both Gilbert's commentary and the *Glossa*, and where nearly identical passages not to be found in any of the sources appear in both commentaries. One might assume *a priori* that these passages were simply taken by Gilbert from the *Glossa*. However, at least in the case of Gilbert's patristic paraphrases, the context clearly contradicts such an explanation, and demands a reassessment of the relationship between the two commentaries.

The second caveat has to do with the identification of Anselm's "little gloss" with the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms. The anonymous thirteenth-century testimonies cited at the beginning of this chapter claim that Gilbert enhanced the "little gloss (*parva glosatura*)" of Anselm; but Anselm's gloss was not known as *parva* until it became necessary to distinguish it from Gilbert's (longer) *media* and Peter Lombard's (still longer) *magna glosatura*. The appellation "ordinary" is yet later, not used until the fourteenth century.⁵ To claim that Gilbert's commentary is an expansion of the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms is to assume that the *Glossa*, as we know it, is indeed identical to the marginal/interlinear gloss which Anselm is alleged to have developed while teaching in Laon. In fact, it is not at all certain that we have an accurate idea of Anselm's "little gloss" as it existed in the eleventeens. Though Smalley herself did not distinguish between the *parva* and the *ordinaria* glosses, she might well have, for she was aware that "the *Gloss* on various books went through revisions before it was standardized."⁶

In light of this uncertainty surrounding the origins and early forms of the *Glossa*, especially that on the Psalms, a little more caution would not be amiss in discussing questions of influence. I would like to suggest here that while Anselm's "little gloss" was indeed at the core of the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms, it received considerable alterations and additions in the dozen-odd years between Anselm's death and the *Glossa*'s widespread use as a standard textbook in the schools. Thus Gilbert, unlike Peter Lombard, could not have

⁵ B. Smalley, art. "Glossa ordinaria," *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 13 (1984): 452.

⁶ Smalley, *Study*, Preface, x. She does not specify the Psalter here.

“expanded the *Glossa ordinaria*” on the Psalms, because the *Glossa* did not yet exist as such in the second decade of the twelfth century. I would further suggest that it was Gilbert himself, and perhaps other Parisian scholars working from his commentary, who developed Anselm’s “little gloss” into what became the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms.

Perhaps it would be wise at this juncture to insist on the modest proportions of this claim. This is not an attempt to attribute the creation of the entire *Glossa ordinaria* to Gilbert, as H. Glunz once tried to argue for Peter Lombard.⁷ Nor would I be so bold as to suggest that Anselm had nothing whatever to do with the *Glossa* on the Psalms. However, a detailed comparison of these two exegetical works discloses that the direction of influence between Gilbert and the *Glossa* is not unilateral, as has been maintained, but is in reality far more complex and interesting. Collating Gilbert and the *Glossa ordinaria* with the Fathers and Remigius confirms this finding, as will shortly be demonstrated. It therefore seems advisable to review what is really known about the origins of the *Glossa* on the Psalms and about Anselm’s “little gloss”. Any attempt correctly to establish the relationship between Gilbert’s commentary, Anselm’s *parva* gloss and the *Glossa* must take into consideration Gilbert’s extensive and original use of the Fathers, the late appearance of the *Glossa* on the Psalms in the form in which we have it, the fluid, mutable nature of marginal/interlinear glosses, the process of compilation, and the ongoing scholarly and pedagogical efforts by the “Laon *équipe*”.⁸ The result is a dynamic view of the birth of the Ordinary Gloss on the Psalms in Paris, probably towards 1130, out of Anselm’s glosses, Gilbert’s commentary, and the development of the discipline of theology in the schools.

The parva and ordinaria glosses

In order to argue that Gilbert availed himself of Anselm’s gloss and helped develop that, in turn, into the Ordinary Gloss, one must first

⁷ H. Glunz, *History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon* (Cambridge, 1933), especially 103–105, 305–310.

⁸ As Miss Smalley once charmingly called them; the concept is, I think, entirely accurate.

support the contention that the gloss compiled by Anselm and the *Glossa ordinaria* are not one and the same thing. That Anselm of Laon is intimately involved in the compilation which eventually became the *Glossa* on the Psalms (and on the Pauline Epistles) has been adequately addressed by Beryl Smalley, and remains here unchallenged. However, there are many unanswered questions concerning the origins of the *Glossa* on the Psalms. What is the textual basis of Anselm's gloss—did he compile it directly from his patristic sources, or did he edit and add to some already existing *glose perimée*?⁹ What is the history of Anselm's gloss between the time he used it to teach *sacra pagina* in Laon and the time it emerged in Paris some fifteen years later—in other words, what is the relationship between the gloss that Anselm wrote and the *Glossa ordinaria*?¹⁰ And where exactly does Gilbert fit into the history of the *Glossa*—did he have anything to do with its origin, what (if any) was his role in its promulgation, and how does his commentary relate to the *Glossa* and to the marginal/interlinear gloss written by Anselm?

First, let us address the assumption that the marginal/interlinear gloss which came to be known as the Ordinary Gloss is identical to that which Anselm wrote. In her 1937 article refuting H. Glunz's theory that the entire *Glossa ordinaria* was compiled by Peter Lombard,¹¹ Beryl Smalley marshalled the evidence for Anselm's authorship of at least the Ordinary glosses for the Psalter and the Pauline Epistles. The evidence is indeed impressive. We know that Anselm glossed the Psalms: the earliest of many witnesses is the short obituary notice in the *Continuatio Praemonstratensis* for the year 1117, which singles out for mention among his "other works" Anselm's marginal/interlinear gloss on the Psalter. The notice adds that Anselm "compiled" (*ordinavit*) the gloss from the "original expositors", *i.e.* the Fathers.¹²

⁹ Smalley, *Study*, 66; see also her discussion of "obsolete glosses" in "Les commentaires bibliques de l'époque romane: glose ordinaire et gloses périmées," *Cahiers de la civilisation médiévale* (1961): 15–26.

¹⁰ Smalley more or less asks this in "La *Glossa ordinaria*, quelques prédécesseurs d'Anselme de Laon," *RTAM* 9 (1937): 366, without referring specifically to the problems I shall raise concerning the *Glossa* on the Psalms.

¹¹ B. Smalley, "Gilbertus Universalis, Bishop of London (1128–34), and the Problem of the 'Glossa Ordinaria,'" *RTAM* 8 (1936) 24–60; H. Glunz, see note 7 above.

¹² "Anselmus Laudunice civitatis magister nominatissimus . . . qui . . . inter cetera opera sua, etiam in psalterio glosas marginales atque interlinealis de auctenticis expositoribus elimata abbreviatione ordinavit." *MGH SS* 6:448; cited by Smalley, "Gilbertus Universalis," 30.

For the identification of Anselm's posthumously named *parva* gloss with the *Glossa ordinaria*, Smalley offers the information that both Alexander Neckham and Robert of Bridlington cite as "Anselm" glosses which, on inspection, turns out to be from the *Glossa*,¹³ furthermore, a later twelfth-century manuscript in Hereford contains the *Glossa* on the Psalms, bearing the title "*Psalterium de parva glosatura Anselmi*".¹⁴ In addition, we know that Peter Lombard, composing his own commentary on the Psalms in the late 1130s, frequently quotes the *Glossa*; and though he refers to this source only as "expositor", Herbert of Bosham, writing *ca.* 1170, identifies Peter's expositor as "Anselm".¹⁵

The curious thing is that all of these testimonies date from long after Anselm's death. We do not actually see the gloss on the Psalms in circulation before the 1140s; in fact, it is conspicuous for its absence among the earliest glossed books of the Bible which are recognizably "ordinary" and which mostly hail from Laon. If Anselm indeed had authorized a version of his glosses on the Psalms, one might reasonably expect it to be among those glossed Jobs, Matthews and Apocalypses which originated in Laon in the two decades before 1140.¹⁶ Maurice, prior of Kirkham Abbey, writing in the 1170s or 1180s to Gilbert of Sempringham, attests that he has had Anselm's gloss on the Psalms in his possession "for quite forty-four years"; this would put the gloss in his hands in 1126 at the very earliest (if he wrote in 1170), probably considerably later.¹⁷ Unfortunately, even this does not prove much, since one cannot verify that the gloss which Maurice called Anselmian was in fact identical to the *Glossa ordinaria* as we know it.¹⁸ Possibly the earliest extant datable copy of the *Glossa*

¹³ At least, those glosses which they cite as "Anselm" are also included in the *Glossa*.

¹⁴ Smalley, "Gilbertus Universalis," 32; the manuscript is Hereford O.6. XII. She cites Robert of Bridlington's use of Anselm on the Epistles; for Robert's use of Anselm on the Psalms, see Wilfried Hartmann, "Psalmekommentare aus der Zeit der Reform und der Frühscholastik," *Studi Gregoriani* 9 (1972): 328–329. Robert was prior of Bridlington 1147–1160; Alexander Neckham died in 1217.

¹⁵ Herbert explains this in his preface to his own revision to the Lombard's *Magna glosatura*; printed in Glunz, *History of the Vulgate in England*, 343. See also Smalley, "Gilbertus Universalis," 28n.

¹⁶ Patricia Stirnemann, "Où ont été fabriqués les livres de la Glose Ordinaire dans la première moitié du XII^e siècle?" *Le XII^e Siècle: Mutations et renouveau en France dans la première moitié de XII^e siècle* (Paris, 1994), 262, 264.

¹⁷ Smalley, "Gilbertus Universalis," 30–31.

¹⁸ Smalley tended to believe that "'Psalterium glosatum' in the mid-twelfth-

on the Psalms is that contained in codex Troyes, BM 511, which is part of the same set of glossed Bible books, made around 1140 (probably in Paris) for Prince Henry, to which copies of both Gilbert's biblical commentaries also belonged.¹⁹

There is in short, a disconcerting gap in our knowledge of the whereabouts, and the content, of Anselm's gloss before about 1140. We know that the so-called *parva glosatura* as it appeared in the 1140s was essentially the same as what eventually became known as the *Glossa ordinaria*, but do we know what Anselm's gloss looked like in the early eleven-teens when he used it to teach *sacra pagina* in the classrooms of Laon?

It has recently been confirmed through painstaking work by Patricia Stirnemann and others that it was about 1140, in Paris, that manuscripts containing what is recognizably the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms and on some other books of the Bible begin to appear, including those which had already debuted in Laon some fifteen years earlier. These early Ordinary Glosses have the great majority of the glosses which were to settle down into the familiar fixed text by the third quarter of the century.²⁰ It is also just about this time that Gilbert was teaching in Chartres and above all in Paris, at the "bishop's hall" (and possibly across the river on Mont Sainte-Geneviève), where he attracted enthusiastic crowds of students.²¹ We know he was using glosses to lecture on Scripture, and the glosses he used seem to be those which were being transformed into the Ordinary Gloss. For example, we have seen that Stephen Langton recounts an anecdote concerning Gilbert's lectures on the Acts of the Apostles I:13 in which Gilbert avails himself of what appears to be an early version of the *Glossa* on that book.²² Gilbert apparently also was active in com-

century could only mean the *Gloss*" ("Gilbertus Universalis," 35). This is patently incorrect; there are a great many glossed Psalters from the mid and even late twelfth century which are not even related to the *Glossa*, yet are titled "*Psalterium glosatum*" with no apologies.

¹⁹ Smalley, "Gilbertus Universalis," 44; see also discussion of dating of Gilbert's commentary, chapter 2 above.

²⁰ Smalley, *Study*, 64; Guy Lobrichon, "Une nouveauté: les gloses de la Bible," in *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, ed. Pierre Riché and Guy Lobrichon (Paris, 1984), 103–111.

²¹ See chapter 1.

²² From Langton's commentary (ca. 1180) on the book of Chronicles: "... hi [apostles] sunt XII boves sub mari eneo ... Super hoc requisitus Gilbertus Porretarius, respondit se hanc historiam nunquam invenisse, et ita deceptus est, quia ad memoriam non reduxit hoc." See above chap. 1, p. 22. Smalley gives more of this text (from Paris B.N. lat 14414 fol. 93) in "La *Glossa ordinaria*," 370. In fact the *Glossa*

menting other books of the Bible, for besides his commentary on the Epistles of Paul, written in the 1130s, an academic *accessus*-type prologue traditionally and plausibly attributed to him introduces the *Glossa* on Apocalypse.²³ It will be remembered that the Book of Revelation was one of the first to receive its Ordinary Gloss, and is strongly associated with Laon.

And, of course, by 1140 or so Gilbert's own commentary on the Psalms was in circulation. It was a tremendous scholarly achievement. But how was it as a teaching tool? The marginal/interlinear format was proving its viability in the classroom. Its adaptability and brevity, its very openness, allowed the master tremendous flexibility. He could skip the more rudimentary glosses, if his class were advanced; he could allow for *quaestiones*, concentrate on the literal, emphasize Augustine at the expense of Cassiodorus; in brief, he could tailor such a gloss to his interests and his audience. The popularity of the form is indisputable: as the other books of the bible joined the growing ranks of those with nascent "ordinary" glosses, their glosses too were prepared in the same marginal/interlinear format. When Gilbert expounded the Psalter, he undoubtedly lectured from a marginal/interlinear glossed text, one which his teaching thus advertised and popularized. But what gloss was this? The marginal/interlinear *parva* gloss compiled by Anselm? Or something closer to, perhaps extracted from, his own commentary? Or something which was becoming the *Glossa ordinaria*?

Perhaps the answer is "all of the above".

After Anselm died in 1117, Gilbert left Laon to continue his career as master of the sacred page. He took with him Anselm's method of teaching from a glossed text and popularized its use in Paris. It is also conceivable that he brought to Paris either a copy of Anselm's collected glosses, or at least his own *reportatio* from Anselm's teaching,

eventually incorporated an explanatory note to identify the "sea of bronze," sparing later teachers Gilbert's embarrassment.

²³ See S. Berger, *Les Préfaces de la Bible*, 69; for an excerpt in English, see A. J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia, 1988), 169. Manuscript Hereford O.5. VIII, given to Hereford cathedral by archdeacon Ralph Foliot (ob. 1195) names "Gilbertus Pictaviensis" as author of the preface; see Smalley, "La *Glossa Ordinaria*," 370n. It certainly does read like Gilbert, and like his other writings was very popular, even being translated into Middle English and French; see Minnis, *ibid.*, 273n. Van Elswijk accepts Gilbert's authorship of the Apocalypse Prologue as "fort probable" and lists others who accept it as well: Berthaud, Clerval, Vernet, Spicq, Hayen, Gammersbach and Smalley; *Gilbert Porreta*, 73, 58 and n., 59 and n. Guy Lobrichon rejects the attribution; "Une nouveauté," 113.

And, obviously, he had his own richly documented and well-organized commentary on the Psalms. As he taught, a great deal of what Gilbert achieved in his commentary must have found its way into the Anselmian marginal/interlinear gloss from which he had once studied and from which he continued to teach.

A twelfth-century catalogue of recent illustrious authors appears to confirm this hypothesis.²⁴ The compiler reports: "Taking into consideration master Anselm's manner of glossing (which, because of its extreme brevity, could only be understood by those schooled in the expositions of the Fathers), Gilbert made the gloss more extensive, and thus more clear." The compiler then adds, "He expounded, in a continuous manner, the Psalms [and] the Epistles of Paul . . ."²⁵ The compiler seems explicitly to contrast "*fecit glosam prolixior*", to fill out Anselm's exiguous marginal/interlinear gloss, with "*exposuit continuatim*", to write a continuous commentary, suggesting that these were two different operations, *i.e.* that Gilbert both elaborated Anselm's gloss and wrote a continuous commentary.²⁶ At the very least, this catalogue entry emphasises the laconically inadequate quality of Anselm's original gloss, a description which does not fit at all well the *Glossa* on the Psalms as we know it, with its copious marginal notes and frequent identification of sources.

Anselm's *parva* gloss thus evidently stood to benefit from material accrued during years of serving as Gilbert's teaching text. Its randomness would have been alleviated by the programmatic organization which Gilbert's cross-index could provide, and its enigmatic terseness by his synthesis of Patristic sources governed by that program. The *parva* gloss would also profit from the focus which Gilbert's abbreviated *accessus* brought to each Psalm, controlling the exegetical direction of its commentary while opening up questions of historical

²⁴ The so-called "Appendix", from the last third of the century, is edited by Nikolaus M. Häring, "Two Catalogues of Mediaeval Authors," *Franciscan Studies* 26 (1966): 195–211. See above, chap. 1, p. 21.

²⁵ "Considerato quippe magistri Anselmi Laudunensis glosandi modo, quod videlicet nimia brevitate non nisi ab exercitatis in expositionibus patrum posset intelligi, glosam prolixior

²⁶ Of the three manuscripts of this "Appendix", those of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (Paris, B.N. lat. nouv. acq. 314 and London, Brit. Mus. Harl. 3115) read "*exposuit itaque*", suggesting a causal relation between the two sentences. The twelfth-century manuscript (Douai, Bibl. de la Ville 246; probably the original, see Häring, *ibid.*, 196) has no "*itaque*".

context, authorial voice, and other concerns of the “modern” student. The resulting “fortified” gloss would be well on its way to becoming the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms.

The textual parallels

To substantiate this hypothesis, let us look again, more closely, at the way Gilbert manipulates his patristic and Carolingian source material in order to construct his commentary. As illustrated in the last chapter, Gilbert does not merely select and offer apposite quotations from his various sources. Instead, what he presents in his comments to a given psalm verse is much more often a pointed synthesis of more than one source at a time, usually Augustine and Cassiodorus. Gilbert is deliberate and discriminating in his choices: the passages which he weaves together from his sources are selected not only for their pertinence to the overarching theme of *Christus integer* announced in Gilbert’s Prologue, but also to both the cross-indexed subjects and the minor themes articulated in each division of each psalm, which he lays out in the miniature *accessus* to each psalm. Finally, Gilbert may mix in supporting material from Jerome and Remigius, or even (rarely) add material not from one of these sources (his own contributions?) in order to offer optional viewpoints and add nuance to the Augustinian-Cassiodoran matrix.

Comparing Gilbert’s synthesis to the patristic and Carolingian originals and to the parallel passages in the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms illuminates the complex relationship among them.²⁷ We shall take as our first text Psalm 20:2–3, which in Gilbert’s scheme is the third of the eight psalms pertaining to the dual nature of Christ:

Domine, in virtute tua laetabitur rex, Et super salutare tuum exultabit vehementer./ Desiderium cordis eius tribuisti ei, Et voluntate labiorum eius non fraudasti eum.

(In thy strength, O Lord, the king shall joy; and in thy salvation he shall rejoice exceedingly./ Thou hast given him his heart’s desire, and hast not withholden the will of his lips).²⁸

²⁷ The reader is reminded that the following analysis is at best a beginning until a critical edition of the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms is a reality. The Rusch 1480 edition which I use here certainly includes material added through the second half of the twelfth century and even later.

²⁸ Biblical citations are provided for the sake of clarity, and are taken from the

Here is what Augustine and Cassiodorus have to say concerning these verses (Psalm text is italicized):

Augustine: *Domine in virtute tua . . . Domine, in virtute tua, qua Verbum caro factum est, laetabitur homo Christus Iesus. Et super salutare tuo . . . Et super hoc, quo vivificas omnia, exsultabit vehementer. Desiderium animae . . . Desideravit manducare pascha, et ponere cum vellet, atque iterum cum vellet sumere animam suam; et dedisti ei. Et voluntate . . . 'Pacem meam,' inquit, 'relinquo vobis'; et factum est.*

(*Lord, in thy strength*, by which the Word was made flesh, Jesus Christ the man *shall rejoice*. *And in thy salvation . . . And in that by which you impart life to every creature he shall rejoice exceedingly. Thou hast given . . . He desired to eat the Paschal meal, to lay down His life when he willed and to take it up again when He willed, and thou hast given [it] him. The will of his lips . . . He said 'My peace I leave with you'; and it was done.*)²⁹

Cassiodorus: *Domine, propheta dicit ad Patrem: in virtute tua, id est in omnipotentia maiestatis tuae, in qua et Filius regnat . . . Sequitur et super salutare tuum exsultabit vehementer, id est in eo quod per eum salvasti homines, Filius tuus, qui Salvator est exsultabit. Addidit quoque vehementer, ut quanta est copia in beneficio, tanta sit et gaudii magnitudo. . . . (Desiderium . . .) Sed ille solus est qui desiderio desideravit mori, quando se pro omnium salute offerebat occidi; ut pretiosus sanguis eius mundum redimeret, ne diabolus eum adhuc iniquia praesumptione vastaret. Voluntas vero labiorum eius fuit, quando spiritibus imperabat immundis, languores diversos sermonis sui sanabat imperio, praedicationes quoque suas devotis mentibus inserebat. Constat enim in nullo voluntatem eius fuisse fraudatam: quando omnia quae fieri iussit impleta sunt.*

(The prophet says to the Father: *Lord, in thy strength*, in other words, in the omnipotence of Thy majesty in which Thy Son also reigns . . . Next comes *And in thy salvation . . .* that is, Your Son who is Savior will rejoice because through Him You have saved men. He added *exceedingly* so that the greatness of His joy is as considerable as His bounty in giving. . . . (*His desire . . .*) But He is the only one who with desire,

Vulgate; any textual variants offered by Gilbert will be noted. I have followed the English translation of the Douai-Reims Bible since it better reflects the wording of the Vulgate. For the sake of verbal congruence, I occasionally modify the translations provided by P. G. Walsh and by S. Hebgin and F. Corrigan for Cassiodorus and Augustine (see chap. 4, n. 3).

²⁹ Augustine, *En. in Ps.* 20:1-3 (CCSL 38:115).

desired to die, when He offered Himself for execution for the salvation of all so that His precious blood might redeem the world, and the devil might not continue to ravage it with wicked arrogance. *The will of his lips* was when He gave orders to unclean spirits, healed different illnesses by the command of His word, and implanted His preaching in committed minds. It is certain that His will was *not withholden* in anything, for all that He ordered to be done was fulfilled.)³⁰

In his miniature *accessus* to this psalm, Gilbert follows Cassiodorus in introducing as its topic Christ's two natures in one indivisible Person, and describes the three divisions of the psalm. Because the first part of the psalm is unpromisingly generic, Cassiodorus had rather vaguely labeled it "concerning the Incarnation". Gilbert, however, as soon as he begins the body of the commentary, improves on his source, insisting on two salient facts of the Incarnation: its nature (that Christ is equally God and man) and its purpose (that humankind should be redeemed). The prophet, he says, summarizes the "merit" (the equality in deity) and the "reward" (the salvation of humankind through the sacrifice of the Son). Gilbert then weaves together words and ideas from Augustine and Cassiodorus to create a synthesis which, while far more concise than either, delineates more clearly the psalm's theme of Christ's combined humanity and divinity, and relates it to the economy of salvation. Here, then, are Gilbert's comments on Psalm 20:2–3; to make the distinct threads of the fabric more immediately visible, Gilbert's borrowings from Augustine are in small capitals, and his Cassiodoran inspirations are in bold-face; the psalm lemmata are, as always, italicized):

Gilbert: O domine **pater**, rex **filius** tuus, HOMO CHRISTUS qui Hebraice Messias ab unctione, *laetabitur in virtute tua*; hac scilicet quod VERBUM FACTUM EST CARO, in quo est **coomnipotens**. Ecce meritum. *Et super salutare tuum*: ecce premium, **id est in hoc quod per se salvatorem** IUSTIFICAS OMNIA.³¹ *Exsultabit vehementer* id est secundum **quantitatem beneficii**; et hoc ideo, quia *tribuisti ei desiderium cordis eius* scilicet COMEDERE PASCHA QUOD DESIDERAVIT ET ANIMAM PONERE, et ITERUM SUMERE, et

³⁰ Cassiodorus, *Ex. Ps.* 20:1–48 (CCSL 97:182).

³¹ Gilbert gives "*iustificas*" for Augustine's "*vivificas*"; there is nothing in the manuscripts I have seen to suggest that this is scribal error, although it would be an easy mistake to make. Perhaps Gilbert's manuscript of Augustine was faulty, or more likely the substitution was a conscious one with Pauline inspiration. The *Glossa ordinaria* (Rusch) has "*vivificas*".

mundum redimere PRO UT VOLUIT. *Et voluntate labiorum eius non fraudasti eum, quia quicquid dixit, FACTUM EST, scilicet demones fugati, infirmi sanati, predicatio recepta.*³² Dixit enim ‘PACEM RELINQUO VOBIS,’ ET FACTUM EST.

(O Lord Father, the king Your Son, the man Christ (which is in Hebrew ‘Messiah’ because He is annointed), *shall rejoice in your strength*, namely that by which the Word was made flesh, in which He is co-omnipotent [with You]. Behold the merit. *And in thy salvation*: behold the reward, that is, because through the Savior Himself, You justify everything. *He shall rejoice exceedingly*, that is, according to His great bounty; and for this reason, because *thou hast given him his heart’s desire*, namely to eat the Paschal meal which He desired, and to lay down His life, and take it up again, in order to redeem the world as He willed. *And thou hast not withholden the will of his lips*, because whatever He said was accomplished, namely demons put to flight, the sick healed, His preaching received. For He said ‘My peace I leave you,’ and it was done.)³³

This rather cumbersome method of indicating Gilbert’s debt to Augustine and Cassiodorus has at least the advantage of graphically illustrating how the two sources are inextricably merged and, in their merging, take on a new force and clarity through Gilbert’s direction. His own contributions, such as specifying the “merit” and “reward” of the Incarnation, and substituting the Pauline “*iustificas*” for Augustine’s less pointed “*vivificas*”, also serve to focus attention not only on the doctrine of the two natures, which Cassiodorus already emphasises, but also on its practical, salvific end, the redemption of mankind. This return to a pastoral theme—the spiritual healing of the Church on earth—is as typical of Gilbert’s commentary as the seamless interweaving of his sources.

The *Ordinaria* glosses for these same verses³⁴ occasionally are closer to the patristic sources than Gilbert is (as the second entry below shows). Others, however, like the third and fifth glosses below, indicate a close relationship to Gilbert. These latter two interlinear glosses are particularly intriguing. Both combine elements of Augustine and Cassiodorus, though they identify their sources as one or the other.

³² This clause (“quia . . . recepta”) is densely paraphrased from Cassiodorus, (“quando spiritibus . . . impletua sunt”).

³³ MS Paris B.N. lat. 12004 fol. 24v.

³⁴ I have reproduced all of the glosses for the passage in question; there is only one marginal gloss for these verses (from the Rusch edition; other editions of the *Glossa* differ).

(at *Rex*) *homo Christus* (Christ in His human nature)

(at *Rex*) *quia tibi coomnipotens* (because [He is] omnipotent along with You)

(at *Salutare*) *Cassiodorus: super hoc quod per eum vivificas omnia* (in that [salvation] which through Him gives life to everything)³⁵

(at *vehementer*) *Cassiodorus: ut res magna est* (indicating what a great thing it is)

(at *Desiderium*) *Quia*

(at *Desiderium*) *Augustinus: comedere pascha et cum vellet ponere animam et sumere et mundum redimere* (to eat the Paschal meal and, when He wishes, to lay down His life and take it up again and redeem the world)³⁶

(at *voluntate*) *Aug/Cass: verbum quoque eius impletus est, fugando demones, sanando infirmos, predicatio quoque eius recepta est* (his word was fulfilled by routing demons, healing the sick; and his preaching was received)

(at *voluntate*) *quicquid dixit factum est* (whatsoever he said was done)

(margin, at *Domine*) *Summam proponit scilicet meritum et praemium* (He proposes the most important thing, namely the merit and the reward)

The fifth entry from the *Glossa* (at *desiderium*), though it is identified as “Augustine”, incorporates the Cassiodoran twist “to redeem the world”. In discussing Christ’s “desire”, Gilbert had deliberately combined his two patristic sources in order to make explicit the necessary relationship between the redemption of humankind and the united natures of Christ. However, no such theological program is manifest in the sketchy phrases which constitute the *Glossa* on these verses. Therefore it is difficult to imagine the reasons a compiler might have melded Augustine and Cassiodorus in this fashion, unless, of course, he was extracting his comments from a source which had already done so.

A similar conflation occurs in the third Ordinary gloss listed here (at *salutare*). The interlinear gloss is true to the original “*vivificas*” of Augustine, yet does not simply quote Augustine’s phrase “*super hoc quo vivificas omnia*”. Instead, the gloss is identified only as “Cassiodorus” and in fact includes his phrase “*quod per eum [salvatore]*,” which Gilbert

³⁵ The Rusch edition identifies this as “Cassiodorus”, but there is no mention of “*vivificas omnia*” in Cassiodorus; see note 12 above. MS Laon 29 does not offer an identification here; interestingly, it also reads closer to Augustine, omitting the “*per eum*”.

³⁶ The Rusch edition identifies the source of this gloss as “Augustine”; such identification is lacking in the mid twelfth-century MS Laon Bibl. Communale 29 against which I was able to compare the Rusch *Glossa* for this psalm.

had used to articulate the link between the salvation offered by God and the human nature of Christ. The Cassiodoran phrase, so apt in Gilbert's pregnant paraphrase, is entirely unessential in the interlinear gloss. If the gloss were simply a fragment taken from Cassiodorus or from Augustine, there would have been no need to alter it. Like the Ordinary gloss at *desiderium*, this gloss looks as though it has been isolated from the midst of a tersely edited, "dual-patristic" passage of Gilbert's commentary, omitting the matrix in which the paraphrase was worked out.

Indeed, there is reason to think that originally (or, to be cautious, at some early stage in its existence) the incipient *Glossa ordinaria* did have only a straight citation from Augustine at this lemma. A mid twelfth-century manuscript of the *Glossa* from Laon reads: "*super hoc quo vivificas omnia*"; that is, it gives a straight citation from Augustine, and does not mislabel it as "Cassiodorus".³⁷ Perhaps the interlinear gloss represented in the published *Glossa* is a later development: the result of Gilbert's commentary overlaid on a more "pure" Laonnoise gloss, introducing Gilbert's Cassiodoran phrase even while remaining closer to Augustine. This phenomenon suggests a hypothesis of a prototypical Anselmian gloss, extracted more or less directly from the Fathers (as Anselm's gloss was reputed to be) which was then amplified with material from Gilbert's commentary, resulting in what we recognize as the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms.

The *Glossa*'s sixth and seventh entries on this verse, (at *voluntate*) also suggest an origin in Gilbert's commentary. The two are identified somewhat ambiguously as "Augustine/Cassiodorus, and indeed the first part is a much condensed paraphrase from Cassiodorus, while the second gloss echoes Augustine's words. They surely were not excerpted directly from the Fathers. The construction of Gilbert's sentence ("because whatever he said was accomplished, namely demons put to flight, the sick healed, His preaching received") makes perfect sense, and wraps up the healing message with Augustine's quotation of John 20:27. The *Glossa ordinaria*, however, separates the Cassiodoran and Augustinian halves of his sentence. The Cassiodoran bit ends up standing well enough on its own, but the *ordinaria* gloss "*quicquid dixit factum est*" makes utter nonsense of Augustine's comment. In addition, the same gloss replicates the sense of the preceding gloss ("*verbum quoque eius impletus est*") and there is no obvious

³⁷ MS Laon Bibliothèque Communale 29.

need for it to be repeated. This suggests that here, too, the *Glossa* is extracted from Gilbert's paraphrase of the two Fathers.

But what do we make of the fact that the more Cassiodoran *ordinaria* gloss on "*voluntate*" is actually closer to Cassiodorus than Gilbert is? The *Glossa* iterates Cassiodorus' "[*verbum*] *quoque impletus est*"—a phrase not picked up by Gilbert. This suggests two possibilities: either this is a retrofitting of the *Glossa* to bring it more in line again with its patristic sources as the *Glossa* became more standardized later in the century; or, that this bit of original Cassiodorus is a carryover from the "original" Anselmian gloss taken, as we are told, directly from the Fathers.

Finally, the sole marginal gloss on these two verses is enigmatic, to say the least; it is by no means apparent what the "merit" and "reward" are supposed to be. Gilbert spells it out. Is this his extrapolation from Anselm's gloss? Or is the *Glossa* here a reminder of Gilbert's exposition of this passage?³⁸

In attempting to sort out the mare's nest of textual priority in the Gilbert—*Glossa ordinaria* relationship, we have so far looked primarily at context. Establishing priority of text by more formalist means does not look particularly promising in this case. For example, sometimes an explanation which is favored in Gilbert's commentary is introduced in the *Glossa* by "*vel*", that is, it is offered as a secondary or optional reading. Scholars doing comparisons of texts conventionally accept such key words (*aut*, *vel*, *aliter*, *aliquis*) as indication that the compiler is about to borrow from another source. But this is not invariably the case; in many instances the "or" is simply transferred from the original source, since neither Augustine nor Cassiodorus were averse to offering more than one plausible explanation. In the case of a marginal/interlinear gloss such evidence becomes totally meaningless, because of the random distribution of the glosses. Nor can priority be established merely on the appearance of a *vel*, since in some cases all of the relevant glosses are thus indiscriminately introduced. Furthermore, comparisons of the *Glossa* to Gilbert frequently show mutual switching of explanations prefaced by *vel*. If one were simply borrowing from the other, it would be reasonable to find the borrower reflecting the priorities of his source, and offering the second opinion in second place; yet we find that the *Glossa* might

³⁸ The marginal reference is not in all editions. It does, however, appear in MS Laon 29; see note above.

have “explanation ‘A’ *vel* explanation ‘B’”, while in Gilbert we find “explanation ‘B’ *vel* explanation ‘A’”. For these reasons an analysis of the priority of texts based on *vel/aliter* type constructions simply will not work.

The contextual approach, on the other hand, reveals its usefulness again in an analysis of a selection from Gilbert’s comments on the latter part of Psalm 138:18, “*Exsurrexi, et adhuc sum tecum* (I rose up and am still with thee). The following example demonstrates how Gilbert extrapolates from his source (here, Augustine) and how the *Glossa* can be seen to be drawing on Gilbert’s paraphrase.

Here are Augustine’s comments:

Exsurrexi, et adhuc sum tecum, quid est? Iam passus sum, inquit, sepultus sum: ecce surrexi, et adhuc me non intellegunt secum. *Adhuc tecum sum*, id est, nondum cum ipsis; quia nondum agnoscunt. Sic enim legitur in evangelio, quia post resurrectionem Domini nostri Iesu Christi, sibi apparentem non continuo cognoverunt. Est et alius sensus: *Exsurrexi, et adhuc sum tecum*: ut hoc tempus significare voluerit, quo adhuc in occulto est ad dexteram Patris, antequam reveletur in claritate qua venturus est ad iudicandum de vivis et mortuis. Et deinde dicit quid interea per totum hoc tempus, dum iam resurrexit et adhuc cum Patre est, . . . (etc.)

(*I rose up, and am with you still*; what does this mean? I suffered, he says, and was buried: behold, I have arisen, and still they do not understand that I am with them. *I am still with you*, that is, not yet with those, because they do not yet recognize [Me]. For we read in the Gospel that after the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, they did not at once recognize the Lord when He appeared to them. Another meaning is: *I rose up* . . . as if the prophet wished to signify the present time, where He is *still* hidden at the right hand of the Father, before it is revealed in the clarity with which He is to come to judge the living and the dead. And thereupon he says, in the meantime, throughout all this present time, while He is now risen and still with the Father . . .)³⁹

Gilbert’s briefer comments follow. Again the psalm text is italicized, while the words of Augustine are in small capitals for ease of comparison.

Gilbert: Sequitur, *exsurrexi* de morte, et *sum tecum adhuc* sicut ante mortem quod putaverunt se tulisse illi qui me interfecerunt; hoc enim illis non videbatur de mortuo. Vel *tecum adhuc* NONDUM CUM IPSIS discipulis QUIA

³⁹ Augustine, *En. in Ps.* 138:25,1–26.2 (CCSL 40:2008); the English translation is my own, in default of an available published translation.

NONDUM AGNOSCUNT. SIC ENIM IN EVANGELIO LEGITUR⁴⁰ quod POST RESURRECTIONEM SIBI APPARENTEM dominum NON CONTINUO COGNOVERUNT. Vel *adhuc* TOTO HOC TEMPORE, etsi resurrectio magnum signum sit deitatis, *sum tecum* id est pluribus OCCULTUS ut tu, id est nondum credor deus esse sicut nec tu; et omnibus etiam *sum* IN OCCULTO AD DEXTERAM tuam quo usque REVELETUR CLARITAS IUDICATURI.

(Then follows, *I rose up* from death, and *am still with you* as I was before the death which those who destroyed Me believed themselves to have caused; for this [*i.e.* that *I rose up* and *am still with you*] was not evident to those [executioners] from the dead body [of Christ]. Or, *I am still with you*, not yet with those disciples, because they do not yet recognize [Me]. Thus we find in the Gospel that after the resurrection, they did not at once recognize the Lord when He appeared to them. Or, *still*, through all this time, although the resurrection is a great sign of deity, *I am with you*, that is, for many, hidden like You; that is, I am not yet believed to be God, just as You are not; and to all *I am* as yet hidden, at Your right hand, until the brightness of Him who is to judge should be revealed.)⁴¹

We pause for a moment to notice Gilbert's penchant for couching his explanations as if in the words of the speaker in the psalm, in this case Christ; Gilbert says "those who destroyed Me" rather than "those who destroyed Him". Similarly, the "*tu*" which Gilbert frequently employs is generally not addressed to his readers, but, depending on the speaker, to God (as in this instance), to the obdurate Jews, to Christians faithful or stumbling, etc. This is not particularly characteristic of Gilbert; Augustine and Cassiodorus frequently apostrophize God, their congregations, heretics and other imagined audiences.

More importantly, we might also note that the non-Augustinian portions of this gloss (presumably Gilbert's contribution) subtly insist on the combined deity and humanity of Christ: His very real death, resulting in a convincingly dead human body, which then rose up to be seated at the right hand of the Father, whence doubts as to His Godhead will be dispelled at the Second Coming. These comments serve to emphasize the cross-indexed theme of this psalm which Gilbert points out in the miniature *accessus* (the dual nature of Christ), a theme which, though implicit in both Augustine and Cassiodorus, tends to get lost in the course of their lengthy expositions.⁴²

⁴⁰ For example Matthew 28:17, Luke 24:13-32, John 21:4-7.

⁴¹ MS Paris B.N. lat. 12004 fol. 185r.

⁴² Cassiodorus agrees here with Augustine's point of view (see below for more on Psalm 118); Gilbert follows Augustine's wording.

The *Glossa ordinaria* offers the following comments on this verse:⁴³

(all at *adhuc*.) *Sicut ante mortem, quod putaverunt se tulisse Judaei* ([Still with you,] as before the death which the Jews believed they brought about)

Vel adhuc id est ipsa morte, quod non videtur de mortuo (Or, still, that is, [even] in that death; which [fact, namely that I am still with you,] is not apparent from the dead [body])

Vel etsi resurrectio sit signum deitatis, tamen adhuc sum occultus pluribus, tecum id est ut tu (Or, even though resurrection be a sign of deity, yet I am still hidden from many, with You, that is, as You are hidden)

Augustinus: *Adhuc sum tecum* NONDUM CUM IPSIS per notitiam, QUIA NONDUM AGNOSCUNT, quia non mox post resurrectionem Christum agnoverunt. Vel TOTO HOC TEMPORE *tecum sum* IN OCCULTO AD DEXTERAM PATRIS, ANTEQUAM REVELETUR IN ea CLARITATE QUA VENTURUS EST

(I am still with you, not yet with those through knowledge [of him], because they do not yet recognize him, because they did not acknowledge Christ soon after the resurrection. Or, through all this time I am with you, hidden at the right hand of the Father, before being revealed in that clarity with which he is to come.)

The relationship of these *ordinaria* glosses to Gilbert's commentary is decidedly complex. First of all, here is an instance of the *Glossa* introducing, with the suspicious *vel*, a phrase (*vel adhuc id est ipsa morte . . .*) which is in fact part of Gilbert's primary interpretation; but as noted above, this alone is less than clinching proof that the *Glossa* borrowed from Gilbert.

More interesting is the fact that a single complete idea (*Sequitur, exsurrexi . . . videbatur de mortuo*) introduced by Gilbert to stress the shared humanity and divinity of Christ, is rendered by the *Glossa* as two distinct, indeed alternative, glosses. This is not an instance, as we saw in Psalm 20, of the *Glossa* following more closely some wordier original source, since this passage is found only in Gilbert and in the *Glossa*. Despite their apparent similarity, there are major differences between Gilbert and the *Glossa* here. The *Glossa*'s comments are far simpler, explaining that Christ is "still" with us, (gloss a) as He was before His death (the *Glossa*'s tag concerning the Jews is enigmatic in this lack of context), or (gloss b) as He is even after death, though this is not apparent because of His death (not apparent to whom?)

⁴³ I include all the marginal notes from Rusch for this verse segment. There are some interlinear glosses, unattributed.

The gloss does not indicate, but this would be a mildly surprising assertion, if it is meant to refer to Christians).

Gilbert's comment is not only more complex but is, in a sense, more "historically" oriented than the *Glossa* here. He discusses, as does his source Augustine, the time close to the actual crucifixion and resurrection. His final clause ("*hoc enim illis non videbatur de mortuo*") refers not to Christians at all but to Christ's crucifiers, who actually believed that they had succeeded in killing Christ because they did not understand the crucial fact of His deity, but saw only His humanity. This is, after all, what Psalm 138 is about: according to Gilbert (following Cassiodorus), it is a psalm prophetically proclaiming the dual nature of Christ.

A suggestive detail is the *Glossa*'s substitution of "*Judaei*" for Gilbert's "*illi qui me interfecerunt*". One might suppose that the "original" source had "*Judaei*", and that Gilbert left it out. Elsewhere Gilbert indicates that he tends rather to the opinion that the Romans, not the Jews, were technically responsible for the death of Christ, though it was the sins of all mankind which provided the ultimate cause.⁴⁴ Still, it would be remarkable for a twelfth-century author, especially one copying from another source, consciously to substitute such a circumlocution without specific cause (for example, unless he were actually arguing about the Romans' or the Jews' culpability). For that reason it seems more likely that the original reading was "those who destroyed Me", i.e. Gilbert's reading.⁴⁵

Another intriguing detail to be noticed in the *Glossa ordinaria* on this verse is the clean separation of the Augustinian bits, neatly collected and labelled (the "authorial" words), from the non-Augustinian bits (mere "magisterial" words). The phrase "*ad dexteram Patris, antequam reveletur*" in the *Glossa* is identical to Augustine's words, while Gilbert, typically, has his speaker addressing the Father, and thus substitutes "*ad dexteram tuam*". This suggests that the *Glossa* here relies directly on the Augustinian original (again: relic of Anselm's patristic *parva*

⁴⁴ There is a heartening lack of anti-semitism in Gilbert's writing; while he deplores, as he must, the "obduracy of the Jews," there is an undercurrent of respect. This agrees with the little we know about his relations with the Jewish community; at least one anecdote, recounted by Peter the Chanter, depicts him debating with, and converting, Jews in Paris, though this is a somewhat stock theme. See Smalley, *Study* p. 78n.

⁴⁵ Both Gilbert and the *Glossa* explain, appropos of the beginning of verse 18, that the Jews were compared to "sand" because of the sterility of their faith.

gloss? or garnishing the developing *Glossa*?) On the other hand, the phrase “*toto hoc tempore*” is Gilbert’s parsing of an Augustinian phrase (“*interea per totum hoc tempus*”) to fit his own sentence construction; such a rewording is not necessary in the context of the *Glossa*, yet the *Glossa* boasts exactly the same phrase, clearly borrowed from Gilbert.

All by itself, verse 18 of Psalm 138 is thus full of tantalizing suggestions of Gilbert’s influence on the *Glossa ordinaria*. An overall view of the complete comments to this Psalm, however, provides further and clinching evidence. A comparison of Gilbert to his sources and to the entire *Glossa* on Psalm 138 shows unmistakably that Gilbert’s direct source must be the Fathers, and that the *Glossa* in turn is heavily excerpted from Gilbert.

The *Glossa* on Psalm 138 primarily comprises quotations and paraphrases of Augustine and Cassiodorus. These individual glosses cluster around each verse they are meant to explicate; in the earlier manuscripts, they may be indiscriminately to the right or the left of the Psalm text column, or between the lines, depending on how they fit; in other words, each gloss is positioned in relationship to its referent scriptural text, not to each other or to the context from which they were drawn. The marginal glosses are usually identified as to their source, while the numerous, sometimes lengthy interlinear notes are (with very rare exceptions) anonymous.

Like the *Glossa ordinaria*, Gilbert also relies on Augustine and Cassiodorus for his comments to Psalm 138, but of course he incorporates his sources into a continuous commentary—an exceptionally focussed, program-driven commentary—in which the comments relate to each other sequentially and purposefully. In the case of Psalm 138, such a coherent amalgam of the two patristic sources would pose a challenge, because Augustine and Cassiodorus take divergent exegetical paths. While they both agree that the “speaker” in the psalm is Christ, Augustine interprets that to mean the integral, indivisible body of Christ, Head and Members. These two “persons” speak in one voice, sometimes both at once: as the Head, the Son of God, when Christ addresses God in equality, and as the Members, Ecclesia, when He refers to His pilgrimage on earth. Cassiodorus, on the other hand, explains that Christ is speaking in two distinct “voices”, both in His perfect divinity and as the human suffering Servant; for Cassiodorus, however, it is Christ as “Head” alone who speaks throughout, and the psalm does not refer to Ecclesia at all. Their expositions differ accordingly until the last nine verses, where they

both agree that Christ the Head speaks to the Father as an equal; there their exegetical paths converge.

Gilbert is faced with a choice: he could either emphasize the important anti-Monophysite doctrinal theme as Cassiodorus does, or he could follow Augustine's pastoral lead and focus on what Christ's humanity means for Ecclesia in terms of salvation history. Both subjects interest Gilbert, and he wishes to lose track of neither; but to pursue both of his sources simultaneously, while following the narrative of the Psalm, he would have to navigate a wearisome tangle of different "speakers", "persons" and "voices".

In his usual forthright way, Gilbert finds a simple way out of the morass. First, in his *accessus* to Psalm 138, he notes that this is the eighth out of a series of eight psalms particularly concerned with the two natures of Christ.⁴⁶ Then instead of crafting his usual seamless tapestry of sources, he presents a tautly-drawn abbreviation of Augustine's exposition, somewhat re-aligned to accomodate the four psalm divisions which are proposed in Cassiodorus (but which Gilbert slightly alters). Augustine's somewhat rambling remarks also benefit from a structure and focus which Gilbert supplies with help from Cassiodorus, reflecting more conspicuously the theme of the humanity and divinity of Christ.

When he has finished reconstructing Augustine's exegesis on its new framework, Gilbert announces that the entire psalm can also be seen from another vantage point altogether, that is, as the words of Christ the Head, as Cassiodorus expounds it. Going back to the beginning of the psalm, Gilbert proceeds ruthlessly and pellucidly to abridge Cassiodorus up to verse 16 where the expositions of the two Fathers coincide: "*My imperfect being*, and so forth, as is said [above] in the person of the Head (*Imperfectum meum, etcetera, sicut dicta sunt in persona capitis*)" Gilbert says, referring the reader back to the comments which he drew from Augustine, since there was no need to reiterate himself.⁴⁷

The *Glossa ordinaria* does indeed share many phrases with Gilbert's commentary, but putting the two texts side-by-side for the purpose of comparing them would require a complete dissection of the *Glossa*, for its naturally scattered Cassiodoran and Augustinian glosses would

⁴⁶ Cassiodorus had noted this in his *conclusio*; it does not figure as one of Cassiodorus' psalm types laid out in his Preface.

⁴⁷ Paris B.N. lat. 12004 fol. 185v.

have to be regrouped. Instead, let us look at how a few parallel comments from Gilbert and the *Glossa* relate to their sources and to each other. The selections which follow are taken from the comments to Psalm 138:11, “*Et dixi: Forsitan tenebrae conculcabant me* (And I said: perhaps darkness shall cover [oppress] me).”

Cassiodorus: Prima pars versus istius sub ironia pronuntianda est. Frequenter enim aliqua quasi sub ambiguitate proferimus, de quibus dubitare non possumus, sicut in alio psalmo⁴⁸ dictum est: ‘Forsitan vivos deglutissent nos’ et reliqua. Quomodo enim *tenebrae conculcare* poterant, quae ius in tanta gloria non habebant? Ipse enim dicit de se: ‘Ego sum lux huius mundi’.⁴⁹ Sed *conculcavit* ille potius *tenebras*, qui caecitatem primi hominis ad eius posteros transeuntem, misericordiae suae luce superavit. Quapropter hoc commate quo ait: *forsitan tenebrae conculcabunt me*, irridentur illi qui de ipso poterant timoris alicuius nebulas suspicari.

(The first part of this verse is to be spoken ironically. We often make certain statements ambivalently, though we can be in no doubt about them. Take, for example, the words of another psalm: ‘Perhaps they had swallowed us alive’ and the rest. How could darkness oppress Him, when it had no dominion over such great glory? As He Himself says, “I am the light of the world” [John: Rather, He oppressed the darkness when by the light of His mercy He overcame the first man’s blindness which was passed on to his descendants. So in this phrase in which he says *Perhaps darkness will oppress me*, those who had the temerity to suspect dark clouds of fear around Him are being mocked . . .)⁵⁰

Now look at Gilbert’s comments on this verse, from his synopsis of Cassiodorus. Note particularly how he includes the citation from the Gospel of John, as well as much of Cassiodorus’ vocabulary (though not always the exact form of his words), and summarizes Cassiodorus’ entire position with great economy:

Gilbert: Hoc non dubitative sed ironice dicit, irridens eos qui hoc opinantur, quod ipsi qui est ‘lux mundi’ conculcetur a tenebris.

(This [Christ] says, not doubtfully, but ironically, laughing at those who deem that He who is “the Light of the world” should be oppressed by darkness.)

Finally, the *Glossa* offers on this verse only the following interlinear note, unattributed:

⁴⁸ Ps 123:3.

⁴⁹ John 8:12.

⁵⁰ Cassiodorus, *Ex. Ps.* 138:215–226 (*CCSL* 98:1246–1247).

Glossa: ironia: irrisio hoc opinantium, quod ipse qui lux conculcetur a tenebris.

(Irony: a mocking of those who opine that He who is light should be oppressed by darkness.)

The citation of John 8:12, still recognizable in Gilbert's truncated version, is further condensed in the *Glossa* to a merely generic reference to "light". On the whole, the *Glossa* offers far less Cassiodorus, while picking up Gilbert's happy substitution of the verb *opinare* for Cassiodorus' phrase "to have the temerity to suspect". Since it is unlikely that both Gilbert and the *Glossa*'s compiler would have independently hit upon *opinare* as an alternative to Cassiodorus' circumlocution, this suggests that the *Glossa* does not here rely directly on the patristic source.

Instances such as this one, in which the *Glossa* betrays its dependence on Gilbert's paraphrasing, can be easily multiplied. But even this limited comparison serves to point out the impossibility of the suggestion that Gilbert could have constructed his succinct summaries, reproducing faithfully the genuine sense of his sources, from the spartan, anonymous, contextless scraps and shreds in the *Glossa*. It is patently impossible to imagine that Gilbert would have been able (or willing) meticulously to distinguish the Cassiodoran interlinear fragments in the *Glossa* on Psalm 138—often only a disconnected word or two—from the Augustinian ones, then reconstruct the original, integral patristic context from such *disiecta membra*. A judicious application of Ockham's razor is required here: it is far simpler to assume that the *Glossa*'s only entry on this verse is an echo of Gilbert's synopsis, than that Gilbert labored to reconstruct that synopsis around an existing, (presumably) 'Anselmian' phrase.⁵¹

Still, as we have insisted, the relationship between the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms and Gilbert's commentary is not a unilateral one, in either direction, since Gilbert demonstrably was building on some avatar of Anselm's teaching gloss, and there must be a core of Anselmian material in the *Glossa*. Identifying Anselm's contribution is a delicate matter, however, due to the unstable nature of marginal/interlinear glosses, which, unlike continuous commentaries, can be

⁵¹ Peter Lombard might have "religiously preserved the Anselmian nucleus" while composing his own commentary, but Gilbert, as we have seen, plays freely with all his sources; see Smalley, *Study*, 64. Peter Lombard's direct and heavy reliance on Gilbert is still vastly underrated by scholars; Marcia Colish somewhat redresses this oversight in *Peter Lombard* (Leiden, 1994).

and were easily altered. Testimony to its accretive character can be found throughout the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms. The evidence includes glosses which are closer to verbatim excerpts from the Fathers than to the same passage in Gilbert, and glosses which are lacking in Gilbert altogether. The latter tend to be of the mechanical sort: “*ad similitudinem*” near a word to be taken metaphorically, for example. The former occasionally pose a more complex problem. Are such glosses part of Anselm’s own collection, excerpted directly from the Fathers, as his contemporaries reported? Or are they additions made at some point before the Ordinary Gloss crystallized? Are they emendations of Gilbert’s paraphrases, to bring them more into line with the *originalia* as the *Glossa* was growing in prestige and popularity? These questions cannot all be answered in the present state of knowledge about the history of the *Glossa* and its manuscript tradition; but at least we now know that we must ask them.

Problematic passages of the type described above might profitably be compared to the way in which Peter Lombard’s Psalms commentary relates to the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms. As Beryl Smalley showed in her demolition of Glunz’s argument for the Lombard’s authorship of the entire *Glossa* on the Bible, Peter often adds explanatory material to the laconic phrases from the *Glossa*. In these cases it is clear that we are faced with morsels of the Ordinary gloss wrapped in Lombardic elucidation. This is the example which Smalley provides:⁵²

Glossa: Numerat quae patitur, ut quia multa sunt, satis sint Deo, ne peiora patiatur.

P. Lombard: “Numerat” hic, penitens, “que patitur, ut quia multa sunt, satis sint”, id est sufficiant “Deo ne peiora patiatur”.

What Peter’s comment provides here is neither a fresh summary of the patristic sources nor an original approach to the Psalms text; rather, it explains the words of the *Glossa* much as the glosses explain the words of the psalms. As Herbert of Bosham reported, Peter’s commentary was meant, from its inception, to be a “gloss on the *Gloss*”.⁵³ Gilbert, on the other hand, may have borrowed from Anselm’s

⁵² Smalley, “Gilbertus Universalis,” 37. She uses the Venice 1558 edition of the *Glossa* (vol. 3 fol. 139r) and cites the Lombard in manuscript: Trinity College Cambridge B.V.4. fol. 102. The commentary is printed in *PL* 191: 55–1296.

⁵³ Smalley, *Study*, 64.

gloss, but his concern was less to elaborate the *parva glosatura* than to construct, along the lines of a clearly defined program, a new and improved commentary.

This new and improved commentary, for all its advantages, soon had stiff competition, and of its own making. The *Glossa* itself quickly achieved recognition and acceptance, its Anselmian skeleton fleshed out (largely by Gilbert himself, no doubt) with material drawn from Gilbert's patristic synthesis and animated with the sense of purpose and direction imparted by Gilbert's academic Prologue and cross-index program. In matched sets of glossed books of the Bible (*bibliothecae*), the *Glossa* on the Psalms took its rightful place among the other biblical glosses which were on their way to becoming standardized.⁵⁴ Gilbert's commentary never stands in for the *Glossa* on the Psalms in such sets; when it is included at all, as in a few of the earlier *bibliothecae*, it is in addition to the *Glossa*.⁵⁵

Gilbert's Psalms commentary was also soon equalled or surpassed in popularity by that of Peter Lombard. As deservedly popular as it was among serious scholars, Gilbert's commentary was evidently not as practical in the classroom as the flexible marginal/interlinear format which had come to dominate the scholastic scene. The format of Gilbert's continuous commentary did not complement the rest of the *Glossa*, and his commentary was easier to read through than to lecture from. The Lombard's commentary, on the contrary, designed to embrace and explicate the *Glossa* on the Psalms, easily complemented or substituted for it. The format of the *magna glosatura* reveals this relationship; unlike Gilbert's commentary, it is not strictly speaking continuous, but is rather halfway between Gilbert's two-column

⁵⁴ Christopher de Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible and the Paris Booktrade* (Dover, New Hamps., 1984), 7, 24–27. For more on this *bibliotheca*, see chap. 2, p. 30 above.

⁵⁵ Prince Henry's set, one of the earliest, comprised marginal/interlinear glosses for most of the New Testament, plus the Psalms; it also included Gilbert's commentaries on the Psalms and on the Epistles of Paul, catena-style (their biblical texts were already present in the marginal/interlinear gloss), and a few other edifying works, such as the letters of Jerome (not glossed). The marginal/interlinear glosses appear to be early versions of the nascent *Glossa ordinaria*: Lobrichon calls them "laonnoise" and adds that they were judged to be "incomplete" ("Une nouveauté," 108); Glunz too says they are "incomplete" versions of what he called "Peter Lombard's gloss", i.e. the *Glossa* (see p. 125 and note 7 above; his opinion given in G. D. Hobson, "Further notes on romanesque bindings," *The Library*, 4th ser., 15 (1935): 167). For more on Prince Henry's *bibliotheca*, see P. Stürnemann, "Où ont été fabriqués les livres de la *Glose ordinaria*," 264–276.

cum textu layout and the marginal/interlinear *Glossa*. In its usual format, blocks of Peter's commentary are interrupted by blocks of Psalms text in display script, so that the lector moves along, explicating the Psalms in discrete stages. In practice this would have been much closer to reading from a marginal/interlinear gloss, and must have had many of the same advantages in the classroom. Since the Lombard did merge the glosses of his source into a stream of prose, his commentary, unlike the *Glossa*, also can be read independently, and in fact is found (as is Gilbert's) in some manuscripts without the Psalms text interspersed. Still, its roots as a "gloss on the *Gloss*", not as an original commentary, are evident. That the Lombard's commentary widely replaced not only that of Gilbert but the *Glossa* as well is testimony to its effectiveness.⁵⁶

Still, it is an effectiveness which owed much to the commentary it was replacing, since much of Peter's Prologue, his comments on the titles, the abbreviated *accessus* he supplies for each psalm, and his categorization of psalm groups are all influenced by, often taken verbatim from, Gilbert's Psalms commentary.

A more complete evaluation of the relationship between Gilbert's commentary, Anselm's *parva* gloss, and the *Glossa ordinaria* will have to await a critical edition of the *Glossa* on the Psalms and an exhaustive study of its predecessors and its manuscript tradition, a daunting project which has not yet been undertaken. But perhaps a modest beginning has been made here, in the recognition of the active role which Gilbert played in the formation of one of the key scholarly tools of the Middle Ages.

⁵⁶ Peter Lombard's commentary replaced Gilbert's and the *Glossa* not only in general, but also frequently in the *bibliothecae*. See note above, and chap. 2 n. 57.

CONCLUSION

GILBERT AS EXEGETE

The tremendous popularity which Gilbert's Psalms commentary enjoyed in the twelfth century indicates that it found an appreciative audience. Therefore, a summary of Gilbert's exegetical approach should outline for us the *desiderata* of the scholars of his own generation, who were trying to build a theological discipline out of the disparate parts of *sacra pagina* and the profane *artes*.

First of all, and so obvious that it is easy to overlook, Gilbert's commentary provided thorough coverage of the Psalter. The marginal/interlinear glosses for the Psalms which proliferated in the previous decades were fitful and irregular in coverage; a particular psalm or segment might be arrayed in voluminous citations from one of the Fathers, while another might be graced only with a grammatical observation or etymology, or left quite unadorned.¹ In Gilbert's commentary, every verse receives its due explanation, and not only out of some sense of duty or symmetry on Gilbert's part, but because of his desire to treat each psalm, and the entire psalter, as an integral work.² When verses of the Psalms are glossed individually, with no thought for how they reflect the themes of the whole Psalter, some can appear far less significant than others. But Gilbert understood the Psalms to have been authored with a single intention, and approaches his task with a view to demonstrating how each verse helps illuminate the entire picture.

Similarly, Gilbert's choice of sources reassures those looking for coverage, since he relies on the most important sources: Augustine and Cassiodorus were the authors of *the* commentaries on the Psalms, and these constitute Gilbert's main support. Jerome, too was important,

¹ Beryl Smalley, "Les Commentaires bibliques de l'époque romane: glose ordinaire et gloses périmées," *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 4 (1961): 15-26; Guy Lobrichon, "Une nouveauté: les gloses de la Bible," in *Le Moyen Age et la Bible* ed. P. Riché, G. Lobrichon (Paris, 1984), 95-114.

² Maurice Simon remarks this as a novelty apropos of Gilbert's Epistles commentary; "La glose de l'Épître aux Romains de Gilbert de la Porrée," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 52 (1957): 59.

though he wrote on the Psalms only sporadically, and Remigius represented the best of the Carolingian contribution to Psalm exegesis; they too are used judiciously by Gilbert. There is on the other hand no pretention of being complete or definitive. There is no attempt to contrast different patristic or Carolingian views, no *sic et non* line-up of conflicting opinions, no attempt to reconcile discrepant authorities or label them right or wrong. When his authorities disagree, Gilbert is likely simply to present both views, sometimes with an *aut melius*, sometimes not.

Gilbert does constantly make choices, though, among his sources, and there is nothing random or indiscriminate about his selections. His basic criterion is to determine which source will best further the christological/pastoral program which he has engineered for the Psalter. If, for example, in a given verse, Cassiodorus is more explicit on the dual nature of Christ but Augustine is more eloquent on the salvific effects of that nature, Gilbert will combine them; or if Jerome supplies a literal explanation which better clarifies how the historical circumstance of this psalm signifies Christ's redemptive role, Gilbert will include that in his discussion. If, however, his source goes off on a tangent (Augustine does this more often than the others, but all are culpable), Gilbert just omits it; lengthy asides directed to heretics, prayerful apostrophes and the like find no place in Gilbert's order.

This brings us to the second point of Gilbert's popularity, which is that he, like many exegetes of his time, struggled to find an overarching organizational scheme for his commentary. There were two problems connected with teaching or studying theology systematically: the first was to find some means of presenting one's thoughts in a logical, cohesive order; the second was to leave the order of one's subject matter flexible enough to be useful to others who might have other ideas of how to approach the same material.³ On the one hand, Gilbert desired to present his commentary as something pur-

³ Richard Rouse and Mary Rouse observe that the use of non-judgmental means of organization, such as alphabetization, as opposed to subjective means, are an indication that the organizers recognized that different persons might have different reasons for searching a corpus of material. Hence the more objective and flexible a "finding tool" is, the more advanced its creator's concept of searchability. "*Statim invenire*: Schools, Preachers and New Attitudes to the Page," in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Robert L. Benson, Giles Constable (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), 212.

poseful and directed; on the other, if it were too limited in scope it would be useful to fewer scholars.

The first problem Gilbert solved by introducing, from the pedagogical tradition of the liberal arts, the use of the *accessus* to define the focus and the particular problems of the Psalter, and the methods to be used in exploring it. The themes drawn up in the *accessus*-Prologue—Christ as Head and Members, the way in which the psalms signify as prophecy and as poetry etc.—control Gilbert's handling of the entire commentary.⁴ The miniature *accessus* which Gilbert constructs for each individual psalm constantly refers back to the Prologue, reiterating the central theme of *Christus integer*, and specifying in what particular way the psalm under consideration manifests that theme. In this way Gilbert never loses sight of the Psalter's purpose: prophetically to proclaim Christ, God and Man, Redeemer. In other words, the *accessus*-Prologue enables Gilbert to keep the "evangelical" message of the Psalms front and center. The result is a commentary which is not only clearly focussed, guaranteeing that the exegete will not stray far afield, but also one which is seen as a whole, in which the Prophet's salvific message is interpreted as "literally" as possible.

The second problem facing the development of systematic theology was not solved by Gilbert. Until the end of his life, he remained committed to the traditional linear method of exegesis, adhering to the narrative structure of his text even in his commentary on the *opuscula sacra* of Boethius. He did not compile any kind of *summa* or sentence collections. In his two later commentaries (those on Boethius and on the Epistles), however, Gilbert did indicate that he found the old method of glossing somewhat constraining, for he inserted *quaestiones* in order to deal with certain problems in greater detail.⁵

⁴ Peter Lombard also was to use the *accessus* with great success. His own Psalms commentary depends heavily (sometimes verbatim) on Gilbert's for the *accessus*-prologue and for the miniature *accessus* introductions to individual psalms: *PL* 191:61–1296. For Peter on the Psalms, now see Marcia L. Colish, *Peter Lombard* (Leiden, 1994), especially 170–188. His commentary on the Pauline Epistles was similarly organized on the strength of a well-thought out *accessus*-prologue; see Marcia L. Colish, "From *sacra pagina* to *theologia*: Peter Lombard as an Exegete of Romans," in *Medieval Perspectives*, Southeastern Medieval Association 6 (1991), 1–19; Some other commentators used the *accessus* to less effect; see chapter four, p. 118.

⁵ The *quaestiones* which Gilbert introduces in his Epistles commentary deal with the same sorts of pastoral issues which he addresses in the cross-index groupings, and which are returned to time and again in the "Laon" Sentence collections: sin and reconciliation, the Trinity, redemption, justification. Simon, "La glose de l'Épître," 73.

But even in his Psalms commentary, Gilbert expressed the need to address certain pressing issues which commanded the attention of his contemporaries, namely those topics which were also becoming the focus of the sentence collections. Unwilling to interfere with the Psalmist's overall message, or the divinely revealed order of the Psalter, Gilbert yet finds a way to identify certain groups of psalms as particularly appropriate for the discussion of those topics. The means which Gilbert found to do this, the curious and unimitated cross-index system, did not in itself have much of a future, although it was found sufficiently useful for the marginal symbols to be retained (even supplied, if the manuscript were defective) for over a century afterward. But if Gilbert's cross-index itself did not find emulators, it still indicates the pressures towards systematization which were being felt by the theologians of the day, and represents an ingenious attempt to combine the new and the old ways of doing theology. As a marriage of narrative exegesis and "sentences" mentality, the cross-index is peculiarly redolent of the early twelfth-century schools.

Besides coverage and organization, Gilbert offered his audience certain technical advantages. The striking layout of the commentary in its usual presentation includes the two-column *cum textu* arrangement, long a favorite among commentators of profane literature. This format had two advantages: it allowed the reader to refer conveniently to the original psalm text (a useful addition, since Gilbert manipulated the text quite freely, to the point where it is next to impossible to reconstruct the psalm text from Gilbert's lemmata, and the Psalms were less familiar to students without a monastic background). The format also served visually to emphasize Gilbert's exegetical principle of treating each verse as part of the whole psalm, and as part of the whole Psalter. In this latter sense, the dual text format was superior to Peter Lombard's chosen format (blocks of psalm text interspersed with blocks of relevant commentary).

Gilbert also employed to good effect the concept of marginal sigla for identifying sources. References of this sort were not new in biblical exegesis, but considering Gilbert's penchant for paraphrasing his sources, the sigla made identifying those sources easier; they also quietly underscored the fact that, no matter how comprehensive Gilbert's running gloss was, it was still a gloss, and though it was not necessary to return to the integral sources, it was advisable. Similarly, the symbols which Gilbert invented to represent his cross-indexed psalms

enabled the reader to find them easily in the lengthy commentary. The commentary therefore made use of "finding devices" to facilitate immediate study, while in a way it served in turn as a "finding device" for further research.

So much for the technicalities. How would one characterize Gilbert's exegetical mind? Gilbert is clearly the heir to a tradition of Psalms exegesis stretching back to Origen. If one comes to Gilbert's Psalms commentary straight from reading his commentary on Boethius or even on the Epistles, or if one comes to it from, say, Abelard's exegetical opera, one would be taken aback at its "lacks": lack of obvious use of dialectic or *Sprachlogik* for problem solving, lack of *quaestiones*, lack of polemic or speculative or philosophical argument.⁶ What one finds instead of novelty is a synthesis of solid patristic thought, intelligently and systematically applied. In a sense it is a culmination of the tradition of Psalms exegesis.

When one strips away the borrowed plumage of Gilbert's commentary, one finds very few feathers left that can be called his own. His personal contributions take two forms. First, his thinking is reflected in the choices he makes among his sources, or his subtle conflation of the words of two or more sources, to further the stated program of his commentary. Gilbert works like a collage artist, selecting and juxtaposing fragments of masterpieces, bringing out their original message and more, in a new milieu, a new medium, a "modern" context.

The second way in which Gilbert makes his own voice heard is by making more explicit, with the addition of a few well-chosen words, the pertinence of his sources' comments to the themes which he has drawn up. In fact, the places one most often hears Gilbert's own voice are in the introduction to each psalm, where he uses the liberal arts *accessus* to funnel Cassiodorus' old wine into new bottles; and in the most severely abbreviated of the paraphrases, which become less like paraphrases and more like magisterial pronouncements. But of sustained original theological contributions, I have found none.⁷

⁶ Cf. Simon, "La glose de l'Épîtres," 62; Nikolaus M. Häring, "The Commentaries of Gilbert of Poitiers on Boethius," in *Nine Mediaeval Thinkers*, ed. J. Reginald O'Donnell (Toronto, 1955) 23-31.

⁷ Gilbert may yet surprise us; but H. C. van Elswijk indicated the same findings; "Gilbert Porreta als glosator van het Psalterium," *Jubileumbundel voor G.P. Kreling* (Nijmegen, 1955), esp. 292.

Gilbert's interpretation of the velamen of Scripture is of interest, for it is an interesting hybrid of the literal, historical and allegorical senses. It is not "literal/historical" in the sense of the Victorine search for the "Hebrew truth"; Gilbert is clearly not unaware of the concrete historicity of the Psalms, indeed he considers the circumstances of a psalm's composition and performance to be a primary level of signification. The historical characters whose lives intersected with these Psalms were walking prophecies of Christ the Head and the Body (Ecclesia), and as such their lives had meaning for Gilbert. As prefigurings of Christ or as images of the perfect or imperfect Church, the literal and historical meaning of the Psalms translated effortlessly to the allegorical meaning under the guidance of Gilbert's overarching theme *Christus integer*.

On the other hand, Gilbert's exegetical approach might indeed be called "literal/historical" in the sense that it does, in some ways, enter into the affective mode of the author (rather, authors) of the Psalms. That is to say, the writing of the Psalms is put, to a certain extent, into the context of the life of David as king, poet and prophet, for it is only by appreciating that David was those things, that one can understand how the Psalms signify; this Gilbert works out in the Prologue. But David was no theologian. His prophetic utterances came not from his own understanding of the divine message, but from direct celestial inspiration. David's conscious, culturally-influenced poetic response, namely the literary form in which the Psalms have come down to us, is subjected by Gilbert to a literal-historical analysis, but the content is not. In that sense, we need know absolutely nothing about David's own perception of his community, his destiny, or his personal relationship with God; we need only know that he was a prophet.

Overall, probably the closest description of Gilbert's exegetical approach in the Psalms would be "literal/allegorical". Gilbert is interested in the social-anthropological details of David's world only insofar as they clarify the primary intention of the primary Author; through this lens, Gilbert's "literal" vision is transformed to allegory.

Finally, the subject matter of Gilbert's exegesis is, once again, traditional but with a twist. There is nothing new in the concept of the Psalter as prophecy of Christ. It is Gilbert's particular application of this concept which places his commentary so squarely in the early twelfth century. The Psalms had long been used for personal, meditative spirituality, and for communal worship; in these ways the

Psalter was the the monastic “textbook” *par excellence*. But Gilbert’s focus is on *Christus integer*, the whole Christ, Head and Members; and for Gilbert, “Members” more often than not means the earthly Church, the actual community of the pilgrim faithful. The stress which Gilbert lays on the religious life of the laity brings to his reading of the Psalms a Pauline flavor which is alluded to in the very beginning of the Prologue, when Gilbert points out that the *intentio* of the Psalms was to put off the old man in Adam, and to put on the new man in Christ. In this way too the cross-indexed topics on which Gilbert focusses attention reflect the common interests of his contemporary non-monastic colleagues: instead of private contemplation, or the communal worship of a select group, something of the sense of an awareness of the lay community comes through. There is a clear pastoral element to the commentary, altogether fitting coming from the school of Anselm of Laon.⁸

The traditions of *lectio divina* and of secular studies came together in Gilbert’s Psalms commentary, as they came together, in various guises, in the work of his contemporaries. Laon and Chartres both played their part, their “schools” merging both physically and intellectually as students such as Gilbert assimilated what they had to offer, and brought themselves and their ideas to the schools in and around Paris. The particular contributions of Gilbert to the formation of theology as an academic discipline have been explored in these pages, as has his influence on the development of the *Glossa ordinaria*. With Gilbert’s Psalms commentary, twelfth-century theology took several sure strides into the lecture room.

⁸ See especially now Guy Lobrichon’s article “Conserver, réformer, transformer le monde? Les manipulations de l’Apocalypse au moyen âge central,” in *The Role of the Book in Medieval Culture*, ed. Peter Ganz (Turnholt, 1986), 75–94; esp. 85–92 where he argues that the Laon Apocalypse gloss (he calls it “Anselm’s”, perhaps rightly) is full of calls to religious and social reform.

APPENDIX ONE

CROSS-INDEX

Cassiodorus' symbols

Cassiodorus' symbols for identifying examples of the liberal arts as they appear in his *Expositio Psalmorum* (The form of the symbols are as they appear in MS Paris B.N. lat. 2194; in some manuscripts they are more decorative.)

Cassiodorus writes:¹

We have judged that it would be useful to put diverse symbols in after the manner of our ancestors,² in certain places, with their explanations added below, so that any reader who wishes to inquire about similar things will be able to find them without difficulty.

(Diversas notas more maiorum certis locis aestimavimus affigendas. Has cum explanationibus suis subter adiunximus, ut quidquid lector voluerit inquirere per similitudines earum sine aliqua difficultate debeat invenire.)

PP	idioms, <i>i.e.</i> the locutions peculiar to Scripture
P	necessary dogma
P	definitions
SCHE	schemata
ET	etymologies
RP	interpretations of names
RT	rhetoric
TOP	topoi
SYL	sylogisms
R	arithmetic
GEO	geometry
M	music
*	astronomy

Cassiodorus' twelve categories

The twelve categories of Psalms according to Cassiodorus, taken from chapter 17 of the Preface to *Expositio Psalmorum*.³

¹ Before the beginning of the "praefatio" proper: *CCSL* 97:2.

² Cassiodorus apparently derived his inspiration from scholiast tradition: O'Donnell, 160n.

³ *Ex. Ps. praef. c.17* (*CCSL* 97:24–25).

The life of the Lord in the flesh
 The nature of his deity
 The multiple peoples who tried to destroy him
 That the Jews should cease their evil ways
 Christ crying out to the Father in the Passion; the Resurrection
 Penitential psalms
 The prayers of Christ, chiefly in his human nature
 Parables, tropes and allegories recounting the life of Christ
 Psalms beginning with 'Alleluia'
 The fifteen gradual psalms
 Praises of the Trinity
 The seven psalms of exultation

It is obvious that these categories overlap considerably, so that an attempt actually to list all the psalms in any category would result in chaos. The eighth category is particularly bemusing, since the whole Psalter was treated as an allegory of the life of Christ anyway; it is difficult to see why Cassiodorus made this a separate category. In fact, Cassiodorus mostly ignores his own list. He provides a different set of subjects, including the ones used by Gilbert, in the commentary itself: sometimes in the *introductio*, often in the *conclusio*, occasionally in the *divisio psalmi*. In most cases he eventually even provides the numbers of the other psalms in that category, but often not in the first psalm: for example, he does not list the other two complete alphabetic psalms (110 and 111) until the *conclusio* of psalm 118. There are some anomalies, such as when he wrongly indicates that Psalm 84 is among those concerned with divine charity (he actually treats it as one of the psalms of the First Coming).

Some of the other psalm groups which Cassiodorus casually mentions but which Gilbert does not use:

The Lord's future mysteries revealed through David's deeds (Pss 7, 26, 33, 143)
 The coming of Antichrist (Pss 9, 51)
 Miracles conferred on the Jews announcing future sacraments (Pss 77, 104)

The cross-index system

Gilbert of Poitiers's cross-index system for his Psalms Commentary (Symbols are taken from one of the earliest and best manuscripts, Troyes Bibl. Mun. 988)

8 On the two natures of Christ
(2, 8, 20, 71, 81, 107, 109, 138)

2 On the Passion and Resurrection, briefly treated
(3, 15, 27, 30, 56, 63)

-  On penitence
 (6, 31, 37, 50, 101, 129, 142)
-  On prayers [by various individuals]
 (16, 85, 89, 101, 141)
-  On the First Coming
 (18, 79, 84, 96, 117)
-  On the Passion and Resurrection, treated at length
 (21, 34, 54, 68, 108)
-  Alphabetical psalms, imperfect
 (24, 33, 36, 144)
-  On love
 (41, 83, 133)
-  On lamentation
 (73, 78, 136)
-  On both the First and Second Comings
 (49, 95, 97)
-  Alphabetical psalms, perfect (all Hebrew letters)
 (110, 111, 118)
-  Psalms incapable of division
 (116, 132, 150)

APPENDIX TWO

MANUSCRIPTS

I do not intend to reproduce here the standard work on the corpus of manuscripts of Gilbert's Psalms Commentary: N. M. Häring's 1978 article "Handschriftliches zu den Werken Gilberts Bischof von Poitiers (1142–1154)" in *Revue d'histoire des textes*. However, the list he compiled can now be amended and updated, and I have added details on format where I have been able to determine them. The bibliographic information given below is *in addition* to that found in Häring's article; exception is made to information which may prove helpful to readers of the present study.

AMIENS (Bibliothèque de la Ville) 46
ca. 1150; Sélincourt: "S. Petri de Selincurte"
prologue: yes
cum textu: no – lemmata scored
cross index: yes
references: yes
295 ff.; 342 × 245; 2 cols.; f. 1^v–138 (pss 1–75), 143^v–295 (pss 76–150); in between are 2 hagiog. texts.
Ps 1 incomplete; Ps 2 missing; Ps 3 acephalic; Ps 150 ends "a corruptione iam libera, in organo cum in . . ."
Häring 149 #4; de Hamel, *Glossed books* 5, 18

AMIENS (Bibl. de la Ville) 47 (172c);
13c; Corbie: "Che livre chy est à l'esglise de Corbye. Psaultier glosé."
(f. 150^v)
prologue: yes
cum textu: no – lemmata scored
cross index: yes; incomplete
references: yes
f. 1–149; 268 × 190; 2 cols.
Häring 150 #5

ANGERS (Bibliothèque Municipale) 46 (39)
12c; St-Serge?
Psalms 1–100 only
prologue: no
f. 1–165, 307 × 215; 2 cols.
initials; on f. 165^v are a few 14c poems
Häring 150 #7

ARRAS (Bibl. Mun.) 120 (664) "Glossa in Psalterium"
13c; Ourscamp (via St Vaast): 14c hand "Istud psalterium pertinet monasterio

URSICAMPI—Qui ipsum alienaverit, anathema sit, nec Deum facie ad faciem videat.”

prologue: yes

f. 1–178

Häring 151 #10; Landgraf, *Einführung in die Geschichte der theologischen Litteratur der Frühscholastik* (Regensburg, 1948), 79

BERLIN (Staatsbibl. Preuss. Kulturbesitz) Lat. Fol. 751 (Görres 64) “Liber psalmorum cum glossa Gilberti Porretani”

12–13c; “Liber monachorum s. Marie in Hymmerode, ordinis Cisterciensis, Treverensis diocesis” (f. 150^v, 14c note)

prologue: no? f. 1 begins Psalm 1 and commentary

cum textu: yes

f. 1–205; 296 × 204; single hand throughout

Large init. B, with tendrils (9.5 cm high); blue and red. Similar to Berlin Philipps 1646.

Häring 152 #18

BERLIN (Staatsbibl. Preuss. Kulturbesitz) Philipps 1646 (Rose 7)

12c, late; “Collegii Parisiensis Societatis Iesu 406” (f. 1, 14c note)

prologue: no?

cum textu: yes; and lemmata scored in black

references: yes

f. 1–214; 230 × 175; 2 col. Liturgical series of initials plus 51, 101 and Psalm 1 “B”.

Häring 152 #17

BOURGES (Bibliothèque publique) 56 (50)

12c, mid; St. Sulpice (104)

prologue: yes

cum textu: yes (not alternate line); and lemmata scored

cross index: partial

references: yes; many corrected or “moved”

“Nota” etc.

Psalm titles are not included in Psalms text column

Liturgical and tripartite series of initials

f. 1–222; missing f. 2

Häring 153 #22; Leroquais, *Psautiers* I, 107 notes an 18c note on fol. 1^v: Gilbertus P. episcopus Pictaviensis scatet erroribus quibus a s. Bernardo diffamatus est.

BRUGGE (Bruges) (Bibl. Publique de la Ville) 47 and 48A

13c; Ter Duinen (Les Dunes): 47, f. 111^v and 48A, f. 88^v: “Iste liber est Beate Marie de Dunis. Siquis . . . anathema sit.”

47: Pss 1–76:

f. 1–111 (comm. on f. 1^v–108); 260 × 180; 2 col, 37 lines

48 A: Pss 80–150:

f. 1–87^v; 250 × 180; 2 col, 37 lines. Between f. 18^v–19, 3 folios are cut

away (*i.e.* pss 95–100); f. 89^v–127^v, *Chronicon fratris Martini*, 14c (also mutil.)

prologue: yes

cum textu: no

references: yes

Häring 153 #23 and 154 #24

CAMBRIDGE, Queens College, 5 and 6 (Horne 18)

12c

5: f. 1–169, Ps 1–79

6: f. 1–160, Pss 80–150

cum textu: no (lemmata in red)

references: yes, in red

both liturgical and tripartite series marked by notable initials; Binding is 12c.; erased inscription of the monastic prov. on fly leaf.

f. 160–183^v: Jerome to Paula and Eustochium; commentaries on canticles.

Häring 156 #32 and 157 #33; Landgraf, *Einführung*, 79

CAMBRIDGE, Corpus Christi College: 67 (N.6)

12c; Norwich?

prologue: yes

cum textu: ?; lemmata scored Pss 1–33, 109–150.

references: yes

f. 1–148; attrib. to “Remigius Autissiodor.”

Häring 156 #31

CARPENTRAS (Bibl. de la Ville) 13 (L14)

12c (early)

incomplete: ends mid-Ps 45 “harum nuptiarum desponsationem.”

prologue: yes

cum textu: no; occasional lemmata scored

cross index: no

references: no

pss not numbered

f. 1–138; 240 × 170

f. 1–63 is commentary; rest assorted collection.

Cat. Gen. dates this as “11–12c”.

Häring 158 #37; B. Munk-Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins au XI^e et XII^e s.* (Paris, 1986), 161

DIJON (Bibl. Munic.) 33 (15)

12c, late; Cîteaux

prologue: yes

cum textu: yes

cross-index: no

references: yes

pss not numbered

This manuscript contains discrete interpolations into Gilbert's otherwise normal text.

Manuscript is of Aquitanian origin, according to P. Stirnemann.

344 × 205, 277 ff, 2 col “alternate line” layout; liturgical series initials, illuminated

Häring 158 #38; Leroquais, *Psautiers* 1:180–181 (#149); P. Stirnemann, “Où ont été fabriqués les livres de la *glose ordinaire*,” 276; Yolanta Zaluska, *L'enluminure et le scriptorium de Cîteaux au XII^e siècle* #114 pl. XLV

Thanks to Sherry Lindquist for format information on this MS.

DOUAI (Bibl. Munic.) 253

12c (2/2); Anchin (G.243.D.289): “Liber s. Salvatoris ecclesie Aquiscinctinensis”

prologue: yes

f. 1–196

attributed to Augustine

scribe: monk Jordanus

Häring 158 #39; “Mss à peinture en France VII^e–XII^e s. Catalogue exposit.

Bibl. Nat. 1954”, 64 #155

DURHAM (Cathedral Library) A.111.10

1149–1158; Durham Cathedral

incomplete; pss 80–150

prologue: missing (along with first half of psalter)

cum textu: no; entire lemmata in red

references: yes; in red

f. 1–137

liturgical divisions

Mentioned in a catalogue of mss dated to 1149–1158: C. H. Turner, “The Earliest List of Durham Manuscripts,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1907–1908):121–132.

Häring 158 #42; de Hamel 7, 19, 32

ESCORIAL ([Real] Bibl.) P. II.16

13c; Conde-Duque de Olivares

incomplete; ends mid-ps 148 “O qui estis in exelsis, laudate eum.”

prologue: yes

f. 1–157

attrib. to Gilbertus Magnus, O. Cist.

Häring 159 #43

ESCORIAL ([Real] Bibl.) S. I.12

13c; Conde-Duque de Olivares

prologue: yes

f. 1–206

Häring 159 #44

FLORENCE (Biblioteca Laurent.) Plut VII dext. 9

13c, early; convent of Friars Minor, Florence; given by Henricus de Circulis, 1285

prologue: yes

cum textu: yes; and lemmata scored

references: yes

f. 1–179

Häring 160 #47; Landgraf, *Einführung*, 125

HARVARD f. MS typ 29

12c (3/4); Morimondo (52): “*Psalterium aliud glosatum Gisliberti*”

cum textu: no; lemmata highlighted in yellow

references: yes (apparently only Aug. and Cass., acc. to L. Light)

Previous private ownership (until 1942).

L. Light, *The Bible in the 12c. An Exhibition of Mss at the Houghton Library* (Harvard College Library, Cambridge Mass. 1988), 93, 95; not in Häring

KLOSTERNEUBURG (Stiftsbibliothek) 815

12c, late; Italien

cum textu: yes

cross index: yes

references: yes, “very numerous”

f. 1–144^v

picture of bishop Gilbert f. 1^v.

Häring 141 n. 7, 161 #53

LAON (Bibl. Communale) 30

12c (2/4); St-Vincent

incomplete: at ps 101 (f. 66^v), changes hand ; ends in ps 103 “*Ergo mistici
pocius per abis . . .*” (f. 69^v).

prologue: yes (f. 2r)

cum textu: no; lemmata scored

cross index: no

references: yes

psalms numbered, same hand, ink, scale

f. 1–87^v; 250 × 180, 2 cols

Häring 162 #55; de Hamel 18

LEICESTER (University Library) 11A and 11B

12c (2/2); English

incomplete at end?

prologue: yes

cum textu: no; lemmata scored

11A: f. iii + 1 – 139 + iii, 295 × 220

11B: f. i + 1 – 14 + i, 320 × 225

Mostly in two-column format, but some sections (not strictly by quires) are in long lines across page. N. R. Ker notes, “In the part in long lines, one of the side margins is 70mm wide and has a pair of vertical lines ruled down it . . .” [for insertion of psalms text?]

Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries* (Oxford, 1983) 3:85; see also Ker 4:310, at entry for Shrewsbury 22

Thanks to Patricia Stirnemann for signalling this manuscript.

LeMANS (Bibl. Comm.) 28

14c; Perseigne: "Ex bibliotheca monasterii beate Marie de Persenia, ord. Cisterciensis" (f. 1)

incomplete: ends "Benedictus. Titulus. Ps Davidis ad Goliam. Legitur in libro regum . . . precatur adventum Christi."

f. 1–178

Häring 162 #58

LINCOLN (Cathedral Library) 174 (B.3.1)

c. 1150–1170; Lincoln Cathedral: "Liber s. Marie linc. Psalterium glosatum" (f. 1^v)

cum textu: yes; and lemmata in red

references: yes

f. 1–353

Described in 12c Lincoln Cath. cat. as "#80: de dono Hamonis cancellarii.

Psalterium iuxta glosaturam Gilleberti porrete. simul cum textu et cum rubeo coopertura."

Häring 163 #61; *N.b.*: Häring presents information not germane to this MS, rather to Oxford Balliol 36 (*q.v.*); de Hamel 19–20, 32, Pl. 7; Wooley, *Cat. of the Manuscripts of Lincoln Cathedral Library* (Oxford, 1927) vii.

LINZ (Öffentliches Studienbibl.) 308 (8)

13c; Baumgartenberg: "Liber s. Marie virginis in Monte Pomeris" (Cistercian)

incomplete: "Einige Folios fehlen": Häring

f. 1–103

Häring 163 # 59

LISBON (Lisboa Biblioteca Nacional) Alcob. 58/436

14c

f. 1–204

Index codd. Bibl. Alcobatie (Lisbon, 1775), 185: "Papyreus in-4° . . ." (*sic*).

Häring 163 #62

LONDON (Lambeth Palace) 176

12c

Psalms 1–24 only

prologue: yes; *incipit* "Christus cum membris est materia . . ."

cum textu: no; lemmata scored

references: yes

f. 155–172^v; bound with Iohannis Belet, *Summa de Ecclesiasticis Officiis*

Häring 165 #69

LONDON (British Museum Library) Harley 4804

12c

Stirnemann 274

MADRID (Bibl. Nacional) 80 (48/B21)(B34)

13c; cover stamp of Duque de Uceda

prologue: yes

references: yes

f. 1–180; 337 × 215; 2 cols.

Häring 165 #70

MADRID (Bibl. Nacional) 88 (11524. Hh20)

13c (2/2); French

prologue: yes

f. 1–221

Häring 165 #71

MILAN (Biblioteca Ambrosiana) F 97 Sup. “Glose magistri Giliberti super psalterium”

late 12 or 13c; La Chartreuse de Val-St-Hugon (Savoy)

incomplete; central 50 pss lacking

prologue: yes

cum textu: no

references: yes

f. 1–112; 2 cols.; (bound with 13c letters of ecclesiastics, etc., 112^v–126).

Maria Fontana, “Il commento . . .,” *Logos* 13 (Palermo, 1930) 283–291 (includes edition of prologue and first three psalms); Ada Pagliari, “Il presunto commento cui salmi di S. Lorenzo Giustiniani opera di Gilberto porretano,” *Aevum* 36 (1962) 414–429; Sofia Vanni Rovighi, *La Filosofia di Gilberto Porretano. Miscell. del Centro de Studi Medievali* (Milan, s.d.) 6: “Un esame sia pure non approfondito del commento ai Salmi del cod. 97 Sup. ff. 1–112 della Bibl. Amb. non mi ha promesso di rilevare elementi filosofici in quel commento.”

Häring 167 #77; Landgraf, *Einführung* 79; Loewe, *Prod r. Corp. gloss. lat.* (1876) 179

MILAN (Bibliotheca Ambrosiana) F 116 Sup.

date? Venetian?

prologue: yes

cum textu: no; lemmata in red

cross index: yes, in black

references: yes, in red

Attrib. in MS to St. Lorenzo Giustiniani (ob. 1456)

Pagliari, A. “Il presunto commento . . .” *Aevum* 36 (1962); she used this MS in her edition of Gilbert’s Prologue and Psalm I (422 n.26). Not mentioned or listed by Häring, though he cites Pagliari for Milan F97 Sup.

MODENA (Biblioteca Estense) I, 272 (aQ.8.27)

12c

Ps 1–73 only

f. 1–128

Häring 167 #78

MUNICH (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek) clm 7618

12c; Indersdorf (#218): “Fratrum monasterii B.M. Virginis in Indersdorff” (f. 1)

Pss 1–75 only; ends “superbia. etiam illorum que te oderunt romanorum//”
prologue: yes

cum textu: no; lemmata initialled in red ff.1–7; entirely in red ff.7–33; then not marked
 cross-index: no
 references: yes
 “nota”, etc.; liturgical series of initials.
 f. 1–136; one column
 Häring 168 #82

MUNICH (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek) clm 18131
 15c; Tegernsee (#131)
 prologue: yes
cum textu: yes; and lemmata scored in red throughout
 cross-index: yes, in red
 references: yes, in red
 Pss numbered in arabic numerals, in red
 f. 1–293
 MS includes a commentary on the ferial canticles (f. 293–299).
 This manuscript is evidently copied from Munich clm 22027.
 Häring 169 #83

MUNICH (Bayer. Staats.) clm 22027
 12c; Wessobrun (27)
 prologue: no
cum textu: yes; and lemmata scored in black
 cross-index: yes
 references: yes
 “Nota” etc.
 Psalm titles in red
 Psalms not numbered; no liturgical sequence evident.
 This manuscript is of Parisian origin, according to P. Stirnemann.
 f. 1–176
 Häring 169 #84; Stirnemann 269, 285n.75, plate VI

ORLEANS (Bibliothèque Municipale) 52 (49)
 12c (3/4); St-Benoît-sur-Loire
 Begins at Psalm 9:29 (Vulgate; Hebrew 10:8)
 prologue: no (acephalic)
cum textu: yes
 ff. 434; 333 × 250; 2 cols.; commentary is f. 1–431
 Titled “Petrus Lombardus in Psalmos”; attribution accepted by *Catalogue Général* but corrected by Leroquais.
 Dated by Leroquais to “première moitié du XIIe siècle” but by Patricia Stirnemann to third quarter, northeast French origin; personal communication May 1993.
 Leroquais, *Psautiers* 1:290 # 241; *Catalogue Général* 12:27; not in Häring

OXFORD (Balliol) 36 (Arch. D. 8.5)
 Before 1166; Lincoln Cathedral: “Liber sancte marie lincolnensis” (f. 1^v)
 where it arrived as gift of Bishop Robert de Chesney (d. 1166)

prologue: yes

cum textu: no; lemmata scored

cross index: yes

references: yes

pss numbered

f. 1^v–144

This MS appears in Hamo's 12c catalogue as #60: "Psalterium; iuxta glosaturam Gilleberti sine textu. de dono Roberti secundi bone memorie episcopi". It got to Oxford as gift of William Gray, Bishop of Ely: "Liber domus de Balliolo in Oxon. ex dono Willelmi Gray, Eliensis episcopi" (d. 1498).

Regarding the 12c colophon: H. O. Coxe, *Catal. codd. mss qui in collegiis aulisque Oxon. hodie adserantur* 1 (Oxf. 1852), 10: "Explicit glosatura . . . terra Emerederonis(?)"

W. Cave, *Script. eccl. historia litteraria* (Cologne, 1720) 583: "terra Emerederonis" Landgraf 108 and *Scholastik* 10 (1935) 181: "las Emeredonensis"

Lesne, *Histoire de la propriété eccl. en France* 5 (Lille 1940) 304 n.7: "glosatura M. Petri Porretani super psalterium . . . in terra Lacerdonis."

R. W. Hunt, "The Introduction to the Artes" 96 n.6 corrects the reading: "coram suo magistro Anselmo causa emendationis". The clarity of the actual manuscripts leaves one to wonder at all the confusion.

f. 1^v: Title (later) Glosatura porretani super psalterium; com begins f. 2

Häring 170 #91; de Hamel 5, 18, 29, 32; Ker 4:310 (at entry for Shrewsbury 22)

OXFORD, Bodleian Laud. misc. 459 (SC 1331)

12c

prologue: acephalic

references: yes

mid-Ps 8–150; followed by some glossed biblical canticles, f. 200^v–211^v.

Häring 171 #94

OXFORD, Magdalen lat. 119

12c 3/4; English

Pss 1–87 only; mutilated at beginning

prologue: very end of prologue only (from "Esdra sint ordinati")

cum textu: yes; and full psalm text in lemmata

f. 1–154; 295 × 210

Landgraf, *Einführung* 80; de Hamel 19 n. 27; J. Alexander and E. Temple, *Illuminated MSS in Oxford College Libraries, The University Archives, and the Taylor Institution* (Oxford 1985) #77; Häring 172 #99

OXFORD, Oriel College 77

early 13c

cross index: yes

Rouse and Rouse, "Statim Invenire" 205; *Catalogus Codicum Mss. . . Oxoniensibus*, (Oxf. 1852) *Paris I: Catalogus cod. mss. collegii orielensis* 27 #77; not in Häring

PADUA, Bibl. Antoniana 298

12c

prologue: yes

f. 1–178

Häring 173 #102

PARIS, Bibliothèque Mazarine 202 (659)

12c (2/4); St. Martin des Champs, Paris

prologue: yes

cum textu: no; lemmata highlighted in pale yellow

cross index: yes; same hand and ink

references: yes; in red ink

Ps numbered in red

Nota etc. in black (all marginalia in same hand as text)

195 ff. 2 cols. 225 × 143

12c note in ms: “Spsalterium [*sic*] magistri Gilberti, unum volumen, quod fuit Angodi”; 13c notes include: “R. Dei gratia Senonensis archiepiscopus”; “Liber sancti Martini de Campis”; and “Iste liber est domini Guillelmi presbiteri, qui manet in domo archipresbiteri Sancti Severini, et tradidit illum in memoriale mihi pro sermonibus. Frater Jo. de Rupela.” 18c: “Quicumque eum furatus fuerit . . . anathema sit. Ex bibl. fratrum minorum magni conventus parisiensis 1717.”

Liturgical series of initials are gilded; initials for tripartite divisions are not gilded but are larger than the other initials.

“Angodi” also did the manuscript of Euclid’s *Geometry* at Chartres (lat. 10257).

Häring 179 #129; de Hamel 18; Van Elswik, *Gilbert Porreta*, 47; Stirnemann 274

PARIS, Bibl. Mazarine 203 (254)

13c, Oratoire

prologue: yes

cum textu: no; lemmata scored in black

cross index: partial

references: yes; in black, same hand

Pss numbered in black

f. 1–150; 2 cols. 265 × 189

No liturgical or other divisions. Messy; lots of omissions entered in margins;

14c hand note in margin at mid ps 101 (f. 92): Huc usque glosa Gilleberti, exinde Lombardi (f. 92) and in fact this is so; Peter Lombard’s commentary replaces that of Gilbert; then at Psalm 118 “phe” the commentary *returns* to Gilbert. Few references, and Pss no longer numbered, in the Lombard section.

Häring 179 # 130; de Hamel 9, 18

PARIS, Bibl. Mazarine 204 (662)

13c

prologue: yes; Beatus vir. Materia huius libri est Xristus integer . . . and continues as normal

cum textu: yes

cross index: partial

references: yes

Pss numbered with arabic numerals, same hand and ink

f. 1–146; 2 cols.; 294 × 254

Squeezed in before each Ps, a short prayer in a more recent hand.

Häring 180 #131 (no remarks on the orations; follows Molinier's *Catalogue des MSS de la Bibl. Mazarine* 1:75 in noting that the Prologue is "missing")

PARIS, Bibl. Mazarine 979 (663)

12c; Celestines, Paris: "Celestinorum Beate Marie de Parisius. 122" (f. 143^v)

prologue: yes

cum textu: no

cross index: one single figure!

references: yes

"Nota" etc.

Pss numbered

New Testament references are added in the margins

f. 1–152; 255 × 160; 2 cols.

f. 9bis–140^v is Gilbert's commentary.

f. 140^v–143 is a commentary on Canticles (in the same 12c hand) "qui on peut attribuer à Gilbert", says Molinier, *Cat. des MSS de la Bibl. Mazarine*, 1:474. The rest of the manuscript is 14c.

Also on f. 143^v: *Istum liber attulit frater Durandus et ad eius usum per me, provincialem, fuit consensus.* (signed) N. Regis

Häring 180 # 132

PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 439

12c (mid); N. French

prologue: yes

cum textu: yes; and lemmata scored

cross index: yes

references: yes

Psalms numbered, same hand

Nota, etc.

No liturgical or other divisions

f. 1–192^v; "Putant" and "Trinity" fragments, f. 193; (see Häring 174 #105 and *Scholastik* 38 (1963))

PARIS, BN lat. 456

13c

prologue: yes, with references

cum textu: yes; "alternate line" layout; lemmata scored

cross index: partial (but some were partially cut away when margins were trimmed; index was probably complete)

references: yes

"Nota" etc. (also often trimmed away)

Pss not numbered

Ps 1–62 only; f. 1–72^v

Liturgical series divisions, but in fact mostly blank spaces where illuminated initials should go; many rubricated psalm titles also missing. Small red initials for major ps divisions (Pars tertia, etc).

Häring 174 #106; *Rev. bibl.* xxii, 292; Van Elswijk, *Gilbert Porreta* 628; Landgraf, *Introduction à l'histoire* (1973) 108; Pagliari "Il presunto commento" 421

PARIS, BN lat. 1977

late 12c; (from a Cistercian monastery—Savigny?)

prologue: no

cum textu: yes

cross index: yes

references: yes

"Nota" etc.

Psalm titles in red

Fragments only: Ps I – Ps 8:8

f. 136–145^v

These fragments are bound with the Psalms glosses by Haimo of Auxerre; the *Quaestiones de divina pagina* of Robert of Melun; Hugh of Fleury, etc. . .

Häring 175 #107; Contreni, *Speculum* (1976) 415

PARIS, BN lat. 2577

12c (mid)

prologue: no (acephalic)

cum textu: no; lemmata not scored either

cross index: no

references: no

titles in red

psalms not numbered

"Nota" etc. in margins

Ps. 101–150 only; f. 1–72; 2 col.

f. 71^v: Expliciunt glose mgri. Gisleberti pictavensis episcopi; ff. 72–74^v, a commentary on some Canticles.

Häring 175 #108; Pagliari, "Il presunto commento" 421; Van Elswijk,

Gilbert Porreta; Manitius, *Lat. Lit. des Mitt.* 3: 214; de Hamel 18 and n.23

PARIS, BN lat. 12004

12c (3/4); Corbie, later acquired by St-Germain-des-Prés: (facing f. 1): "Liber S. Petry Corbiensis". "Sti Germani a pratis. #313"

prologue: yes

cum textu: yes, "alternate line" layout; and lemmata scored

cross index: yes

references: yes

Pss numbered in red, right in column

liturgical series of initials, some historiated, for both Psalms column and commentary column.

f. 1–197; followed (f. 197^v–204) by marg/int commentary on Canticles and, in another hand, "Quicumque vult salvum esse"

A remarkable and attractive manuscript which has attracted attention due to its extensive historiated initials and by the acrostic poem which announces the name of Herbert Durusensis who commissioned the manuscript. The poem is printed in Delisle, *Cab. Mss.* 2:115.

Across top of f. 1: "Indignus qui imprimatur propter errorum sylvam hereseumque multiplitia monstra".

Häring 175 #109; de Hamel 20n, 54n; Chr. de Mérindol, *Liures peint à . . . Corbie . . . XII^e siècle . . .* 1:3n; 2:1976; 3:pl.121–129 and pp. 12, 261ff., 445; A. Boutemy, *De quelques Enlumineurs . . .* 250ff.; plate 28b; L.W. Jones, "The Scriptorium at Corbie, 1: The Library", *Speculum* 22 (1947) 197

PARIS, BN lat. 14418

12c, mid; St. Victor (352): Iste liber est sancti Victoris Parisiensis. Quicumque eum furatus . . . anathema sit. Amen. D. (f. 1)

prologue: yes

cum textu: no

cross index: yes

references: yes

"Nota" etc.

Pss numbered

f. 1–123

f. 123^v, "Putant parum" fragment

Of Parisian origin, according to P. Stirnemann.

Häring 176 #110; de Hamel 18 n. 22; Stirnemann 266, 285 n.74

PARIS, BN 14419

13c (late), St-Victor "Iste liber est S. Victoris parisiensis. Quicumque . . . anathema sit. Amen." (f. 1^v)

prologue: yes

cum textu: no; lemmata scored; rarely abbreviated

cross index: no

references: yes

psalms numbered; verses numbered(!)

"Nota" etc.

Ps titles in red

f. 1–239

Liturgical series of initials.

Häring 176 #111; de Hamel 18

PARIS, BN 16292

12c, late; Sorbonne

prologue: yes

cum textu: no; lemmata scored

cross index: no

references: yes

psalms not numbered

f. 44–186^v

A very inexpensive exemplar, possibly of Italian origin: a few simple red initials are the sole decoration. There are many minor variations and errors in the text. On f. 186^v: "Iste liber est magistrorum de sourbona. Ex legato domini egidii de mantenoi canonici s. Amati de duaco. Precium eius decem sol[idis] Par[isis]."

Häring 176 #112

PARIS, BN 17210

12c (mid); St. Corneille de Compiègne (48): "S. Cornelii compend" (f. 1)
 prologue: yes

cum textu: yes (the pages are *lined* "alternate line" but the scribe used the
 lines in the Psalms text column only as guides); and lemmata scored until
 Ps 22 in red

cross index: yes (somewhat erratically drawn, but accurate)

references: yes

Pss sometimes numbered; more numbers added by later hand

"Nota" etc.

psalms titles scored in red

Psalms initials often left blank, but some are illuminated (as are a few ini-
 tials in the commentary column)

f. 1-232; 285 × 200

Catalan or Southwestern French hand. At one time belonged to St. Maur.
 Elaborate "B" (Beatus vir) with David's musicians, f. 1^v-2.

f. 232-232^v is "Putant parum" as in Paris BN 439; on final folio is written
 "Pridie idus Aprilas audita sunt prima tonitrua apud N."

Häring 176 #113; F. Avril, *Mss enluminés de la péninsule iberique*, (Paris 1982)
 55-56, plate 28

PRAGUE (Metropolitankapitel) 242 (A 138)

13c; f. 1: "Iste libellus fuit domini Johanconis decani pragensis."

prologue: yes

f. 2-124

Ends on f. 124: Explicit. Et ego scriptor. Godes Gennadin. ende. Gode loph.

Häring 181 #138

REIMS (Bibl. de la Ville) 145 (B 73)

12c (2/4-3/4); St. Thierry (94)

prologue: yes

f. 1-136; 362 × 244; 2 cols

Häring 181 #143

ROME, Vallicelliana C.36

12c

prologue: yes: Christus integer cum membris . . . etc.

cum textu: no; lemmata scored

f. 54-149

Ps. 1-100 only; ends: . . . maledicas non direxit inde proficit in conspectu
 o.m. et si apud ///.

Rest in varied collection, *e.g.*: f. 1 Expositio libri Geneseos; f. 2 fragment,
 Jerome's Libri interpret. hebraicorum nominum; f. 14 Augustine, in
 Genesin; f. 40^v Epositio libri Exodi; and 19 more titles.

Häring 182 #147

ROUEN (Bibl. municipale) 118 (A 317)

12c (2/4); Fécamp (f. 2: signature, A 109)

prologue: yes

cum textu: no; lemmata slightly larger than commentary script, and scored in red
 cross index: yes; in red; a few errors are corrected in later hand(s).
 references: yes; in red, same hand.

Pss numbered in red, same hand

f. 1–218; 264 × 176

Hand is “Norman”

lots of corrections in margins.

Häring 183 #148; Genevieve Nortier, *Les bibliothèques médiévales des abbayes bén. de Normandie* (Caen, 1966) 28

Thanks to Fabienne Queyroux for information on this MS.

ST. FLORIAN (Stiftsbibliothek) XI 44

12c–13c

prologue: yes

f. 1–232

Häring 183 #150

SHREWSBURY (Shrewsbury School) 22

12c (2/2); English

prologue: yes

cum textu: no; lemmata scored

psalms numbered; some missing, added later

f. ii + 1 – 85 + iii; 290 × 195

N.R. Ker, *Medieval Mss in British Libraries* 4:310; not in Häring. Thanks to P. Stürnemann for indicating this MS.

TARRAGONA (Biblioteca Provincial) 68

12c

f. 1–270

Häring 184 #153

TOURS (Bibl. municipale) 93

12c, mid; St. Gatien

prologue: yes

cum textu: yes, and lemmata scored

cross index: yes

references: yes

verse caps red, blue

“Nota” etc

Pss numbered

liturgical series marked by historiated initials, gilt

pss titles in red

Same artist as Troyes BM 488

f. 2–198^v

15c owner’s note: Jedel Angle Meloia

211 ff, 304 × 212mm.

Anthems indicated at bottom of pgs; “ce qui laisse entendre que notre psautier a servi à la récitation de l’office . . . (Leroquais, p. 231)

ff. 200–211: Canticles, glossed. (Anon.) and commentary on Symbol

"Quicumque". Also, on f. 199 (not noted by Häring) is *Putant parem* . . . (Jerome)

Häring 184 #155; Leroquais, *Psautiers* 2: 231 #434; Stirneman, 270 and plate VII

TROYES (Bibl. municipale) 488

12c (before 1149?); Clairvaux (D 70)

prologue: yes

cum textu: no; lemmata scored, few abbreviations

cross-index: no

references: some

Tripartite divisions marked with initials

Pss not numbered

This MS constitutes part of Prince Henry's *bibliotheca*. It is austere beautiful and practically pristine. It is made by the same artist as Tours 93 and Troyes 512.

Häring 185 #156; de Hamel 6 and 6n; Stirnemann 265–266, 270, 271, 285 n.74; and dissertation, "Bernard de Clairvaux et le monde Cistercien"

TROYES (Bibl. municipale) 764

12c (2/4–3/4); St. Etienne (B7)

prologue: yes (follows commentary)

cum textu: yes

cross index: yes; lemmata not scored

references: yes

titles in red

pss #d in red, in commentary column (inconsistent)

12c? binding. Liturgical series of initials with "Chartrain" decor, seen also in Paris, suggests Stirnemann.

Commentary f. 1–172; f. 173–196: beginning of treatise by Arnold of Bonneval, *de septem verbis Domini in cruce*.

199 ff; 290 x 190

Leroquais 2: 235 #439: mid or late 12c; Häring 185 #157; Stirnemann 275; not in de Hamel

TROYES (Bibl. municipale) 815

12c (1/2-mid), Clairvaux (B 30)

prologue: no

cum textu: yes; lemmata also scored

cross index: yes (somewhat erratic)

references: yes

Pss numbered; Psalm titles in red; liturgical series of initials.

Spanish origin, suggests Morel-Payen.

f. 1–211, f. 1–207; 265 x 186 mm.

Häring 185 #158; Leroquais 2: 236, #440: "première moitié ou milieu" acc. to script and decoration; Stirnemann agrees. L. Morel-Payen, *Les plus beaux manuscrits de la bibl. de Troyes* (1935) 17, 85–6, pl. X fig. 33.; not in de Hamel

TROYES (Bibl. municipale) 988

12c (1/2); Ste. Marguerite de Beaune: Et est ecclesie, abbati et conventui s.

Margarete penes Belnam. Ita est.

prologue: no

cum textu: yes, and lemmata scored

cross index: yes

references: yes

titles of pss in red; illuminated initials; pss sometimes numbered, verses marked with colored capitals and paraph marks.

Lines and format nearly identical to Tours 93

248 ff., 262 × 183 mm.

f. 1–243 Psalter and Gilbert's commentary; f. 243–248 canticles, glossed—incomplete.

Häring 185 #159; Leroquais 2: 242 #447: "première moitié ou milieu" . . .

"La glose est celle de Gilbert de la Porrée; notre ms date donc tout au plus de la première moitié du XIIe siècle, et non du XIe–XIIe siècle comme l'indique le *Cat gen.* (série in-4° t.II p. 411)." Bouhier D. 41, dated to "11c–12c"; not in de Hamel

VALENCIENNES (Bibl. municipale) 44 (38)

c. 1150; St. Amand (F141)

This Ms is part of a bibliotheca of 17 glossed Bible books, including Gilbert on Epistles, acquired for Abbey of St. Amand in time of Abt. Hugh, 1150–68.

prologue: yes

cum textu: no; lemmata scored

cross index: yes

references: yes, in red

pss numbered in same hand

f. 2^v–172^v; 2 cols; 340 × 232

f. 2: In colored capitals, original "title": In nomine Domini Jesu Christi.

Incipiunt glose super Psalterium, collecte de dictis sanctorum doctorum a magistro Gisleberto, postea pictavensi episcopo.

In a different hand is appended a bull of Celestine III [on marriage of King and danish Queen].

Häring 187 #166; de Hamel [cites this MS by its old number 38] p. 7

Note: Häring includes Valenciennes 42 and 43 in his list of MSS of Gilbert's commentaries; this is erroneous. The MSS in question, along with Valenciennes 40 (which Häring does not mention) form a continuous commentary on the Psalms in three volumes of fifty psalms each; these are apparently a sort of "edited" version of Gilbert's commentary.

VATICAN (Biblioteca Apostolica) lat. 89

12c–13c

prologue: yes

cum textu: yes, to Psalm 108: but laid out in "Peter Lombard" format [see below]; after Psalm 109, two-column *catena* format with lemmata scored.

cross index: partial

references: yes, in red, same hand.

Pss numbered in red.

Liturgical series of decorated initials.

The format of this MS is unusual in that for roughly the first third it follows the layout characteristic of the Lombard's commentaries on the Psalms and Epistles: namely, a block of verse from Scripture, in larger script, followed by a block of relevant commentary in small script. Psalm 109 is missing its biblical text, though space is left for it; beginning with Psalm 110, the MS reverts to the so-called *catena* layout, *i.e.* the commentary with underlined lemmata, arranged as usual in two columns.

Häring 189 #170; M. Fontana, "Il commento ai Salmi di Gilberto della Porrée", *Logos* 13 (1930): 283–284

Thanks to Dr. Deana Copeland Klepper for information on this manuscript.

VATICAN (Biblioteca Apostolica) Barb. lat. 486

12c

references: yes

f. 9–21: Ps 1–10 only (in MS, these ff. have been numbered "53–72" because extant MS begins with f. 45)

The MS also contains a fragmentary "Brevis expositio in psalmos (15c); and in a different hand (f. 31–63^v), a com. [whose?] on Apocalypse and on Job. (f. 64–71^v).

Häring 188 #169

VATICAN Reg. Lat. 2094

13c; S. Croce, Rome: "Hec postilla super psalterium est domus s. crucis in Jerusalem de Roma, Cartusienensis ordinis. Liber s. cruce de urbe ord. Cartusienensis." (f. 2)

prologue: yes

cum textu: no; lemmata scored in brown-black

cross index: yes, incomplete

references: yes; in same brown ink as text.

A contemporary hand (but not the scribe's) numbered some of the psalms in the side margins; later, they were all numbered.

Liturgical series of capitals (relatively elaborate); the rest of the decor is very simple.

f. 1–129

Häring 189 #172

Thanks to Dr. Deana Copeland Klepper for information on this MS.

VATICAN Lat. 4228

13c

prologue: yes

cum textu: no; lemmata scored in black

cross index: yes; incomplete

references: yes; in brown, often with red paraph marks.

Pss numbered in red; occasional corrections in brown.

f. 3–161^v

Liturgical series marked by large, ornate initials. Gilbert's commentary is followed by an anonymous one on the biblical canticles, in a different hand.

Häring 189 #171

Thanks to Dr. Decana Copeland Klepper for information on this MS.

VENDOME (Bibl. Munic.) 20

12c; "Cest livre est de l'abaye de Vendosme" (f. 1, 15c)

prologue: missing? (f. 1 is "lacerated")

f. 1–217; 332 × 225

Cat. Gen. 3:400; not in Häring. Thanks to Patricia Stirnemann for indicating this MS.

VIENNA (Nationalbibliothek) 1323 (Theol. 584)

13c; "liber S. Marie in Wilheringen" (f. 169)

prologue: yes; *Materia huius liber est Christus integer* . . .

references: yes

Commentary begins after two unnumbered ff.

Häring 191 #181

VITRY-le-FRANÇOIS (Bibliothèque municipale) 8

13c; Trois Fontaines

prologue: yes (mutil.; . . . *caput cum membris*)

Liturgical series of decorated initials; the historiated B of "Beatus" has been purloined.

136ff.; 350 × 240; 2 cols.

Häring 190 #179

VORAU (Stiftsbibliothek) 261

12c (before 1190); Vorau Abbey (see below)

cum textu: yes

f. 1–230^v

12c note: "Hic est liber s. Marie sanctique Thome apostoli vorowensium canonicorum. Quem Otakarius archidiaconus marcioni Athachario et ille nostre ecclesie contulit. Hunc nemo auferat ne anathemati subiaceat." According to Häring (following P. Classen, *Zur Gesch.* 261), this Otakar could be the one recorded at Vorau by 1161 and succeeded by 1163; de Hamel (following P. Buberl, *Die Illuminierten Handschriften in Steiermark* [Leipzig, 1911]) holds that the same Otakar was around until 1189, and another until 1192; so that this MS may be as late as that. De Hamel would like to see this *cum textu* format well after the 1160s.

Ps 134:18–135:10; and 138:24–150:6 are cut away

Häring 191 #180; de Hamel 20 and n. 36

WORCESTER (Cathedral library) F 163

13c; Cathedral library

prologue: yes

cum textu: yes

f. 1–214^v

Partial: ends mid Ps 105:4 (et timpano et choro///).
Häring 193 #186

*Manuscripts containing Gilbert's Prologue affixed to different Psalms
commentary or gloss:*

GENEVA (Comites Latentes Coll.) 167

12c

Gilbert's Prologue affixed to an "Anselmian" gloss (i.e. a version of the
Glossa ordinaria)

De Hamel 9; not in Häring

LONDON (British Museum Library) Royal 4.A. VIII

12c

(f. 1^v-3); attached to Psalms commentary of Peter Lombard (f. 3 - 161).

This MS also contains (f. 162^v) a fragment of another Psalms commentary.
Häring 164 #64

OXFORD Bodl. D.2.1 (SC 2312)

12c (4/4); Häring 171 #93; Pächt and Alexander vol.3:24 #226, plate XXII

OXFORD Bodl. Auct. D. 4. 6.

1158-1164; Reading Abbey

Attached to a marginal/interlinear gloss.

Häring 170 #92; Pächt and Alexander, *Illuminated MSS in the Bodleian Library*, Oxford (Oxford, 1966) 3: #164

OXFORD Trinity 58

12c; Carmelites of London

H.O. Coxe, *Catalogus Codicum MSS qui in Collegiis Aulisque Oxoniensibus hodie
adservantur* (Oxford 1852); Alexander and Temple #88; not in Häring

PARIS Bibl. de l'Arsenal 487

12c; St. Martin des Champs: "Hic liber sancti martini di campis . . ." (f. 67^v)

The Prologue (f. 1) is in a different hand than the continuous commentary
(not by Gilbert) which follows. This commentary, which uses a sort of
accessus to introduce each psalm, stops mid-Psalm 89 (f. 66^v); it was attrib-
uted to Cassiodorus. Yet another Psalms commentary fragment begins
f. 67.

Cat. Gen. des MSS de la Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 1:339: "Gilbert de la Porrée";
not in Häring

PARIS (Bibl. Mazarine) 88

12c (mid); St. Martin des Champs

(Originally from Crèpy-en-Valois?)

Attached to a *glose perimée*, in this case a very basic marginal/interlinear
gloss. It is unrelated to Gilbert's commentary, though may share a com-
mon source. Not in Häring

PARIS B.N. lat. 11

12-13c

Gilbert's Prologue is on f173^v, introducing a version of the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Psalms.

S. Berger, *Les préfaces jointes aux livres de la Bible dans les MSS de la Vulgate* (Paris 1904), 44 #99; not in Häring

Reg. Hisp. 2 C 1

13c

S. Berger, *Les préfaces* 44 #99; not in Häring.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abelard. *Historia Calamitatum*, PL 179:125.
- Accessus ad auctores*. Edited by R. B. C. Huygens. Leiden, 1970.
- Alan of Lille. *De fide catholica contra hereticos* I, 30; *PL* 210:333.
- Alberic of Trois Fontaines. *Chronica*, *MGH SS* 23:840.
- Ambrose. *Explanatio in Psalmorum XII*. Edited by Petschenig. Vienna, 1919. *CSEL* vol. 64 part 6 (repr. 1962 as vol. 6).
- Ambrose. *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Expositio Psalmi CXVIII*. Edited by M. Petschenig. *CSEL* vol. 62 part 6 (repr. 1962 as vol. 5) Vienna, 1913.
- Anonymous. *De commendatione magistri Gisleberti*. Edited and translated by Nikolaus M. Häring, "Epitaphs and Necrologies on Bishop Gilbert II of Poitiers." *AHDLM* 36 (1969): 76, 79.
- Anonymous. *Chronicon*. 13th century.
- Arduini, Maria L. "'Magistra ratione': 'Auctoritas', 'Traditio', 'Ratio' von Anselm zu Adelard von Bath." In *Benedictine Culture, 750-1050*, ed. W. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst, 190-233. Louvain, 1983.
- Augustine. *Enarrationes in Psalmos*. Edited by E. Dekkers. *CCSL* vols. 38-40. Turnholt, 1956.
- . *St. Augustine on the Psalms*. Translated by S. Hebgin and F. Corrigan. Ancient Christian Writers, vol. 29. Westminster, Maryland, 1960.
- Barré, H. *Les homéliaires carolingiens de l'école d'Auxerre, Studi et Testi*. Vatican, 1962.
- Benton, John F. "Philology's Search for Abelard in the *Metamorphosis Goliae*." *Speculum* 50 (1975).
- Berger, S. "Les préfaces jointes aux livres de la Bible dans les manuscrits de la Vulgate." *Mémoires présentés à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*. Vol. 11, 40-46. Paris, 1904.
- Berthaud, A. *Gilbert de la Porrée, évêque de Poitiers, et sa philosophie*. Poitiers, 1892.
- Berty, A., and L. M. Tisserand. *Histoire générale de Paris. Topographie hist. du vieux Paris*. Paris, 1897.
- Biblia Latina cum Glossa Ordinaria: Anastatical Reproduction of the First Printed Edition, Strassburg c.1480*, ed. K. Froehlich and M. T. Gibson. Louvain, 1991
- Bischoff, B. "Living with the Satirists." In *Classical Influences on European Culture AD 500-1500*, ed. R. R. Bolgar. Cambridge, 1971.
- Bliementzrieder, Franz. "Autour de l'oeuvre théologique d'Anselm de Laon." *RTAM* 1 (1929): 435-483.
- . "Trente-trois pièces inédites de l'oeuvre théologique d'Anselme de Laon." *RTAM* 2 (1930): 54-79.
- . "Théologie et théologiens de l'école épiscopale de Paris avant Pierre Lombard." *RTAM* (1931).
- . *Anselms von Laon systematische Sentenzen*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters 18. Munster, 1919. Vol. 1.
- Boethius, *In Isagogen Porphyrii Commenta*. Edited by S. Brandt, *CSEL* 48.
- Boussard, J. *Nouvelle Histoire de Paris: de la fin du siège de 885-886 à la mort de Philippe Auguste*. Paris, 1976.
- Brady I. "Prolegomena." In *Magistri Petri Lombardi . . . Sententiae*. Quaracchi, 1971.
- . "The Rubrics of Peter Lombard's Sentences." *Pier Lombardo* 6 (1962): 5-25.
- Cart. de l'abbaye de St-Père de Chartres*. Edited by M. Guérard; (1840);
- Cart. de Notre-Dame de Chartres*. 3 vols. Edited by E. de Lépinois, L. Merlet. Chartres, 1862-1865.

- Cart. de Notre-Dame de Josaphat*. Edited by Ch. Métais. Chartres, 1911.
- Cartulaire de l'abbaye de St-Père de Chartres*. Edited by M. Guérard. 1840.
- Cassiodorus. *Expositio psalmsorum* Praefatio c.15.45–76.
- . *Cassiodorus: Explanation of the Psalms*. Edited and translated by P. G. Walsh. Ancient Christian Writers, vols. 51–53. New York, 1990.
- . *Expositio Psalmsorum*. Edited by M. Adriaen. CCSL vols. 97–98. Turnholt, 1958.
- Catalogue Général des Bibliothèques publiques de France*. Vol. 11, Chartres.
- Catalogue of the Library of Durham Cathedral*. London, 1838.
- Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis*. Vol. 1. Edited by H. Denifle and É. Chatelain. Paris, 1889–1897.
- Chatelaine, Émile L. M. *Paléographie des classiques latins*. Paris, 1884–92.
- Châtillon, Jean. “La Bible dans les écoles du XII^e siècle.” In *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, ed. P. Riché and G. Lobrichon. Paris, 1984.
- Chenu, M.-D. “Un essai de méthode théologique au XII^e siècle.” *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 24 (1935): 258–267.
- . *Nature, Man and Society in the Twelfth Century*. Selected, edited, and translated by Jerome Taylor and Lester K. Little. Chicago, 1968. [orig. *La théologie au douzième siècle*. 1957].
- . *Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century*. Selected, translated, and edited by J. Taylor and L. K. Little. Chicago, 1967. [La théologie au douzième siècle, Paris 1957].
- Christian of Stavelot, *Expositio in Mattheum*, PL 106:1264.
- Classen, Peter. “Zur Geschichte der Früh-scholastik in Österreich und Bayern.” *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 67 (1959).
- Clerval, A. *Les Écoles de Chartres au Moyen Age du V^e au XVI^e Siècle*. Chartres, 1895.
- Colish, Marcia L. “Another Look at the School of Laon,” *AHDLMA* 53 (1987): 7–22.
- . “From *Sacra pagina* to *theologia*: Peter Lombard as an Exegete of Romans.” In *Medieval Perspectives*, . . . (. . ., 1991).
- . “Systematic Theology and Theological Renewal in the Twelfth Century.” *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 18 (1988) 2:135–156.
- . “Teaching and Learning Theology in Medieval Paris.” In *Schools of Thought in the Christian Tradition*, ed. P. Henry. Philadelphia, 1984.
- . *Peter Lombard*. Leiden, 1994.
- Commentary on *Disticha Catonis*. MS. Lucca Bibl. pubb. 1433 (11th century). Edited by A. Mancini, “Un commento ignoto di Remy d'Auxerre.” *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 11 (1902), 179.
- Constable, Giles. “The Popularity of Twelfth-Century Spiritual Writers in the Middle Ages.” In *Renaissance: Studies in Honor of Hans Baron*. Edited by A. Molho and J. A. Tedeschi. Dekalb, Il., 1971.
- Contreni, J. “The Biblical Glosses of Haimo of Auxerre and John Scotus Eriugena.” *Speculum* (1974): 411–434.
- Courtès, J. M. “Figures et tropes dans le psautier de Cassiodore.” *Revue des études latines* 13 (1964), 362–366.
- Coxe, H. O. *Catalogue of the MSS in the Oxford Colleges*. Vol. 1. Oxford, 1852.
- Daly, Lloyd W. *Contribution to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Collection Latomus 90. Brussels, 1967.
- Daniélou, J. *Origène*. Paris, 1948.
- Delhay, Phillippe. “Grammatica et ethica au XII^e siècle.” *RTAM* 25 (1958): 59–110 [reprinted in *Enseignement et morale au XII^e siècle*, (Fribourg, 1988)].
- . “L'Enseignement de la Philosophie Morale au XII^e Siècle.” *Mediaeval Studies* 11 (1949).
- . “L'origins scolaires au XII^e siècle,” *Traditio* 5 (1947).
- Dickey, Mary. “Some Commentaries on the *de inventione* and *ad Herrenium* of the Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries.” In *MARS* 6 (1968): 1–41.

- Dronke, Peter. "New Approaches to the School of Chartres." *Anuario de estudios medievales* 6 (1969).
- Ehlers, Joachim. "Deutsche Scholaren in Frankreich während des 12. Jahrhunderts." in *Schulen und Studium im sozialen Wandel des hohen und späten Mittelalters*. Vol. 30 of *Vorträge und Forschungen*. Sigmaringen, 1986. 106–109.
- Emden, A. B. *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to 1500*. Oxford, 1937.
- Evans, G. R. "The Influence of Quadrivium Studies in the eleventh- and twelfth-century schools." *Journal of Medieval History* 1 (1975): 151–164.
- . *The Language and Logic of the Bible: The Earlier Middle Ages*. Cambridge, 1984.
- . *Old Arts and New Theology: The Beginnings of Theology as an Academic Discipline*. Oxford, 1980.
- Fank, Pius. *Catalogus Voraviensis*. Graz, 1936.
- Ferruolo, Stephen C. *Origins of the University: The Schools of Paris and their Critics, 1110–1215*. Stanford, 1985.
- Flint, Valerie I. J. "The 'School of Laon': A Reconsideration." *RTAM* 43 (1976): 89–110.
- . "Some Notes on the Early Twelfth Century Commentaries on the Psalms." *RTAM* 38 (1971).
- Fontana, Maria. "Il commento ai Salmi do Gilberto della Porrée." *Logos* 13 (1930): 283–301.
- Franklin, A. *Les Anciens Plans de Paris. Notices historiques et topographiques*. Paris, 1878.
- Funkenstein, Amos. "Scripture Speaks the Language of Man: the Uses and Abuses of the Medieval Principal of Accommodation." In *L'homme et son univers I*, ed. C. Wenin, 92–101. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1986.
- Gabriel, A. L. "Les Écoles de la Cathédral de Notre-Dame et le commencement de l'Université de Paris." *Huitième Centenaire de Notre-Dame de Paris*, (1967).
- Geiselmann, Joseph. "Der Abendmahlsbrief des Anselm von Canterbury ein Werk des Anselm von Laon." *Theologische Quartalschrift* 3 (1930).
- Gerhoch of Reichersberg. "Appendix" to Gilbert's Psalms commentary, in codex Paris Bibl. Nat. Lat. nouv. acq. 314, fols. 80v–82.
- Ghellinck, J. de. *Le Mouvement Théologique du XII^e Siècle*. 2nd ed. Bruges, 1948.
- . "'Originale' et 'originalia'." *Bulletin du Cange* 14 (1930): 95–105.
- Giacone, Roberto. "Masters, Books and Library at Chartres According to the Cartularies of Notre-Dame and St-Père." *Vivarium* 12 (1974).
- Gibson, Margaret. Review of de Hamel, *The Library: The Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* 8 no. 2 (1986): 166–169.
- Gilbert of Poitiers. Prologue. ed. Ada Pagliari, "Il presunto commento ai Salmi di S. Lorenzo Giustiniani opera di Gilberto Porretano." *Aevum* 36 (1962): 414–429.
- Gilbert of Poitiers. Prologue and commentary on first three Psalms. Ed. Maria Fontana in "Il commento ai Salmi di Gilberto della Porrée." *Logos* 13 (1930): 283–301.
- Gilbert of Poitiers. *The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers*. Edited by Nikolaus M. Häring. Toronto, 1966.
- Gilbert of Poitiers. "Prologus primus" In *The Commentaries on Boethius*. Edited by Nikolaus M. Häring, 54.
- Gilbert of Poitiers. "Epitaphs and Necrologies on Bishop Gilbert II of Poitiers." Edited by Nikolaus M. Häring. *AHDLMA* 36 (1969).
- Guibert of Nogent. *De vita sua*. Edited by E.-R. Labande. Paris, 1981.
- Güterbock, F. "Aus irischen Handschriften in Turin und Rom." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 33 (1985): 103–105.
- Glunz, H. *History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon*. Cambridge, 1933.
- Guérard, B. ed. *Cartulaire de l'Église Notre-Dame de Paris. Collection des documents inédits sur l'histoire de France*. Vol. 1
- Haenel, G. F. *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum qui in bibliothecis Galliae . . . asservantur*. Leipzig, 1830

- Hamel, Christopher de. *Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Book Trade*. Dover, New Hampshire, 1984.
- Häring, Nicholas M. "Chartres and Paris Revisited," in *Essays in Honor of Anton Charles Pegis*, ed. J. Reginald O'Donnell. Toronto, 1974.
- Häring, Nikolaus M. "A Latin Dialogue on the Doctrine of Gilbert of Poitiers . . ." *Mediaeval Studies* 15 (1953).
- Häring, Nikolaus M. "Abelard Yesterday and Today." In *Pierre Abélard—Pierre le Vénéral*, 341–403.
- Häring, Nikolaus M. "The Cistercian Everard of Ypres and His Appraisal of the Conflict between St. Bernard and Gilbert of Poitiers." *Mediaeval Studies* 17 (1955).
- Häring, Nikolaus M. "The Commentaries of Gilbert of Poitiers on Boethius." In *Nine Medieval Thinkers*. Edited by J. Reginald O'Donnell. Toronto, 1955.
- Häring, Nikolaus M. *The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers*. Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Studies and Texts 12. Toronto, 1966.
- Häring, Nikolaus M. "Commentary and Hermeneutics." In *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*. Edited by Robert L. Benton and Giles Constable. Cambridge, Mass., 1982.
- Häring, Nikolaus M. "Handschriftliches zu den Werken Gilberts Bischof von Poitiers." *Revue d'histoire des textes* 8 (1978): 133–194.
- Häring, Nikolaus M. "The Lectures of Thierry of Chartres on Boethius' *De trinitate*." *AHDLM* 24 (1959): 117.
- Häring, Nikolaus M. "Two Catalogues of Mediaeval Authors." *Franciscan Studies* 26 (1966): 195–211.
- Häring, Nikolaus M. "Zur Geschichte der Schulen von Poitiers im 12. Jahrhundert." *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 47 (1965): 26–29.
- Harrison, Thomson S. "Grosseteste's Concordantial Signs." *Medievalia et humanistica* 9 (1955): 39–53.
- . "Grosseteste's Topical Concordance of the Bible and the Fathers." *Speculum* 9 (1934): 139–44.
- Hartmann, Wilfried. "Psalmekommentare aus der Zeit der Reform und der Früh-scholastik." *Studi Gregoriani* 9 (1972): 313–366.
- Hauréau. *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique*. Vol. 1. Paris, 1872.
- Hauréau. *Notices et extraits de quelques manuscrits latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 6 (1893) 162–173.
- Hexter, Ralph J. *Ovid and Medieval Schooling: Studies in medieval school commentaries on Ovid's 'Ars Amatoria', 'Epistolae ex Ponto', and 'Epistolae Heroidum'*. Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung 38. Munich, 1986.
- Hilary of Poitiers, *Tractatus super psalmos*, *CSEL* 3:15–18.
- Hilary. *Tractatus super Psalmos*. "Instructio Psalmorum" section 17 (beginning at second sentence)–24; *CSEL* 22:14–19.
- Hobson, G. D. "Further notes on romanesque bindings." *The Library*, 4th ser., 15. 1935.
- Hunt, R. W. "The Introductions to the 'Artes' in the Twelfth Century." In *Studia mediaevalia in honorem . . . Raymundi Josephi Martin*. Bruges, 1948.
- Hunt, R. W. "The Introductions to the 'Artes' in the Twelfth Century." *Studia mediaevalia in honorem . . . Raymundi Josephi Martin*, 85–112. Bruges, 1948.
- . "Manuscripts containing the indexing symbols of Robert Grosseteste." *Bodleian Library Record* 4, no. 5 (1953): 241–255.
- . "Studies on Priscian in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries." *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* 1 (1941–1943), 2 (1950).
- Huygens, R. B. C. "Guillaume de Tyr étudiant. Un chapitre (XIX,12) de son 'Histoire' retrouvé." *Latomus* 21 (1962).
- Huygens, R. B. C. "Notes sur le *Dialogus super Auctores* de Conrad de Hirsau et le *Commentaire sur Théodule* de Bernard d'Utrecht." *Latomus* 13 (1954): 420–428.

- Huygens, R. B. C., ed. *Conrad de Hirsau, Dialogus super auctores*. Collection Latomus 17. Brussels, 1955.
- Jeuneau, Edouard. "Deux redactions des gloses de Guillaume de Conches sur Priscien." *RTAM* 27 (1960), 212-247.
- Jeuneau, Edouard. "La Lecture des auteurs classiques à l'école de Chartres durant la première moitié du XII^e siècle." In *Classical Influences on European Culture AD 500-1500*. Edited by R. R. Bolgar, 95-102. Cambridge, 1971.
- . "*Lectio Philosophorum*": *Recherches sur l'École de Chartres*. Amsterdam, 1973.
- Jerome. *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera*, pt. 2. *Opera homiletica: Tractatus sive Homiliae in Psalmos*, ed. E. Dekkers, CCSL 78. Turnholt, 1958.
- . *The Homilies of Saint Jerome*. Translated by M. L. Ewald. Vol. 1, The Fathers of the Church, vol. 48. Washington, 1964.
- John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*. Edited and translated by Marjorie Chibnall as *Memoirs of the Papal Court*. London, 1956.
- Ker, N. R. *English Manuscripts in the Century after the Norman Conquest*. Oxford, 1960.
- Kirkby, Helen. "The Scholar and his Public." *Boethius, His Life, Thought and Influence*. Edited by M. T. Gibson. Oxford.
- Klibansky, R. "The School of Chartres," in *Twelfth Century Europe and the Foundations of Modern Society*, ed. M. Clagett, et al. Madison, 1961.
- Kuttner, Stephan. *Repertorium der Kanonistik I*. Vatican City, 1937.
- Landgraf, A. M. "Die Abhängigkeit der Sünde von Gott nach der Lehre der Früh-scholastik." *Scholastik* 10 (1935).
- . "Probleme des Schrifttums Brunos der Kartäuser." *Collectanea Franciscana* (1938).
- . "Zur Methode der biblischen Textkritik im 12. Jahrhundert." *Biblica* 10 (1929): 445-474.
- . "Die Zuweisung eines Psalmenkommentars an Anselm von Laon." *Biblica* 23 (1942): 170-174.
- Laurentius. "Planctus Laurentii." In "Epithaphs and Necrologies on Bishop Gilbert II of Poitiers," translated by Nikolaus M. Häring. *AHDLM* 36 (1969) 57-61 (translation), 68-72 (edition).
- Leclercq, Jean. *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*. Translated by C. Misrahi. New York, 1961. [originally published as *L'amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu* (Paris, 1957)].
- . "Textes sur Saint Bernard et Gilbert de la Porree." *Mediaeval Studies* 14 (1952).
- . *Pierre le Venerable*. St-Wandrille, 1946.
- Lelong, J. *Bibliotheca sacra*. Vol. 2. Paris, 1723.
- Leroquais. *Psautiers*.
- Lesne, *Les Écoles*.
- Liber Papiensis*. Edited by A. Boretius. *MGH SS* (1875) 4:290.
- Liebeschütz, Hans. *Mediaeval Humanism in the Life and Writings of John of Salisbury*. Vol. 17, *Studies of the Warburg Institute*. London, 1950.
- Light, Laura. *The Bible in the Twelfth Century. An Exhibition of MSS at the Houghton Library*. Cambridge, Mass., 1988.
- . "Versions et révisions du texte biblique." In *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, 85-86.
- Lobrichon, Guy. "Une nouveauté: les gloses de la Bible." In *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, ed. Pierre Riché and Guy Lobrichon. Paris, 1984.
- Lotin, Odon. *Psychologie et Morale aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles*. Vol. 5. *Problèmes d'histoire littéraire. L'école d'Anselme de Laon et de Guillaume de Champeaux*. Gembloux, 1959.
- Lubac, H. de, *Histoire et esprit: l'intelligence de l'Écriture d'après Origène*. Paris, 1950.
- Lutz, C. E. "One Formula of *Accessus* in Remigius' Works." *Latomus* 19 (1960): 774-780.
- MacBain, William. "Remembrance of Things Still to Come: Scribal Memory and Manuscript Tradition." *Manuscripta* 31 (1987): 77-88.
- Martinet, S. *Montloon*. Laon, 1972.

- Maxwell, Woolley R. *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Lincoln Cathedral Library*. Oxford, 1927.
- Menhardt, H. "Der Nachlass des Honorius Augustodunensis." *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 89 (1958).
- Merlette, Bernard. "Écoles et bibliothèques a Laon du declin de l'antiquité au développement de l'Université." 21-53 *Actes de 95e Congrès national de sociétés savants*. Paris, 1975.
- . "Intellectual Training and Attitudes toward Reform, 1075-1150." In *Pierre Abélard—Pierre le Vénérable*.
- Miano, Vincenzo. "Il commento alle lettere di S. Paulo di Gilberto Porretano." *Scholastica: Ratione historico-critica instauranda*. 171-178. Rome, 1951.
- Minnis, A. J. "Discussions of 'Authorial Role' and 'Literary form' in Late-Medieval Scriptural Exegesis." *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 99 (1977): 37-65.
- . "Literary Theory in Discussions of *Formae tractandi* by Medieval Theologians." *New Literary History* 11 (1979) 133-145.
- . *Medieval Theory of Authorship*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia, 1984.
- , and A. B. Scott. *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism c.1100-c.1375*. Revised edition. Oxford, 1991.
- Morin, G. "Le Pseudo-Bède sur les Psaumes, et l'*Opus super Psalterium* de Maître Manegold de Lautenbach." *Revue Bénédictine* 28 (1911): 331-340.
- Mynors, R. A. B. *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Balliol College, Oxford*. Oxford, 1963.
- . *Durham Cathedral Manuscripts*. Oxford, 1939.
- . *New Oxford Annotated Bible*. New York, 1962.
- . *New Oxford Annotated Bible*. New York, 1977.
- Nielsen, Lauge O. *Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century: A Study of Gilbert Porreta's Thinking and the Theological Expositions of the Doctrine of the Incarnation during the Period 1130-1180*. Leiden, 1982.
- Niermayer, J. F. *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*. Leiden, 1984 (1976).
- O'Donnell, J. J. *Cassiodorus*. Berkeley, 1979.
- Otto von Freising, *Gesta Friderici Imperatoris* 1:48 (MGH SS 20:376). Tr. and ed. C. C. Mierow as *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*. New York, 1953.
- Paré, G., A. Brunet, and P. Tremblay, *La Renaissance du XII^e Siècle. Les écoles et l'enseignement*. Paris, 1933.
- Parkes, Malcolm B. "The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book." in *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to R. W. Hunt*. Edited by J. J. G. Alexander and M. T. Gibson. Oxford, 1976.
- Parkes, Malcolm B. "The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book." *Medieval Learning and Literature* (Oxford, 1976).
- Pelster, F. "Gilbert de la Porrée, Gilbertus Porretanus oder Gilbertus Porreta?." *Scholastik* 24 (1949).
- Peuchmaurd, P. "Mission canonique et prédication. Le prêtre ministre de la parole." *RTAM* 30 (1963): 122-144, 251-276.
- Poole, R. L. *Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought and Learning*. 2nd ed. New York, 1920.
- Poole, R. L. "Masters of the Schools at Paris and at Chartres in John of Salisbury's Time." *English Historical Review* 35 (1920); reprinted in *Studies in Chronology and History*, 1934.
- Przychocki, G. "Accessus Ovidiani." *Rozprawy Akademii Umiejetnosci Wydział Filologiczny* [Dissertations of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Philological Section], Series 3, 65-126. Krakow, 1911.
- Quadri, R. "Aimone di Auxerre alla luce dei 'Collectanea' de Heiric de Auxerre." *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 6 (1963): 1-48.
- Quain, Edwin A. "The Medieval *Accessus ad auctores*." *Traditio* 3 (1945): 215-264.

- Radding, Charles. *World Made by Men*. Chapel Hill, 1985.
- Rand, E. K. *A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours*. Vol. 2. Cambridge, Mass., 1929.
- Rashdall, H. *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*. Vol. 3. New edition by F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden.; Oxford, 1936.
- Riché, Pierre. *Écoles et enseignement dans le Haut Moyen Âge*. Paris, 1979.
- . "Jean et le monde scolaire du XII^e siècle," in *The World of John of Salisbury*, ed. M. Wilks. Oxford, 1984. 39–41.
- Riggenbach, E. "Die ältesten lateinischen Kommentare zum Hebräerbrief." *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* . . . 8, no. 1 (1907).
- Robert of Melun. "auctoritatem in verbis auctoris potius consistere quam in sententia." In *Sententia*, ed. R. Martin, *Oeuvres de Robert de Melun* 3. Louvain, 1947.
- Rouse, Richard H., and Mary A. Rouse. "Statim invenire: Schools, Preachers and New Attitudes to the Page." In *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*. Edited by Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable. Cambridge, Mass., 1982.
- Rupert of Deutz. In *Iohannem*. Edited by Haacke, CCCM 9. Turnholt, 1969.
- Salmon, Pierre. *Les 'Tituli Psalmorum' des manuscrits latins*. Collectanea biblica latina, 12. Rome, 1959.
- Santeul, Auguste de. *La Tresor de Notre-Dame de Chartres. Rapport à M. le Ministre de l'Intérieur sur les archives de l'ancien chapitre de la cathédral de Chartres*. Chartres, 1841.
- Servianorum in Vergilii carmina commentariorum*. Harvard ed. 2. Cambridge, Mass., 1946.
- Simon, M. "La glose d'épître aux Romains de Gilbert de la Porrée." *Revue d'histoire Ecclésiastique* 52 (1957).
- Silvain, René. "La tradition des Sentences d'Anselme de Laon." *AHDLM* 22–23 (1947–48): 1–52.
- Silvestre, H. "Le schéma 'moderne' des *accessus*." *Latomus* 16 (1957): 684–689.
- Simon, Maurice. "La glose de l'Épître aux Romains de Gilbert de la Porrée." *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 52 (1957).
- Smalley, Beryl. "Les commentaires bibliques de l'époque romane: glose ordinaire et gloses périmées." *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 4 (1961).
- . "Exegesis and Christian Tradition: The Carolingian Model." In *Schools of Thought in the Christian Tradition*. Edited by Patrick Henry. Philadelphia, 1984.
- . "Gilbertus Universalis, Bishop of London (1128–34), and the Problem of the 'Glossa Ordinaria.'" *RTAM* 8 (1936) 24–60.
- . "Glossa ordinaria." *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 13 (1984).
- . "La *Glossa Ordinaria*, quelques prédécesseurs d'Anselme de Laon." *RTAM* 9 (1937).
- . "L'exégèse biblique." *Entretiens sur la renaissance du douzième siècle*. Paris, 1968.
- . *Study*, Preface to 3rd ed. 1983.
- Southern, Richard W. "Humanism and the School of Chartres," in *Medieval Humanism and Other Studies*. Oxford, 1970.
- . *Platonism, Scholastic Method and the School of Chartres*. Reading, 1979.
- . *Robert Grosseteste. The growth of an English mind in Medieval Europe*. Oxford, 1986.
- . *St. Anselm and his Biographer*. Cambridge, 1963.
- . "The Schools of Paris and the School of Chartres." In *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, eds. Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable. Cambridge, Mass., 1982.
- Spicq, Ceslaus. *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au Moyen Âge*. Paris, 1944.
- Stegmüller, F. *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi*. Vol. 3. Madrid, 1940–1979.
- Stirnemann, Patricia. "Où ont été fabriqués les livres de la glose ordinaire dans la première moitié du XXI^e siècle?" *Le XXI^e siècle: Mutations et renouveau en France dans la première moitié du XII^e siècle* Paris, 1994.
- . review of de Hamel, in *Bulletin Monumental* 143 (1985).
- Stoelen, A. "Les commentaires scripturaires attribués à Bruno le Chartreux." *RTAM* 25 (1958).

- Thesaurus Anecdotorum novissimus*. Vol. 5. Edited by Pez. Augsburg, 1719–1728.
- Turner, C. H. "The Earliest List of Durham Manuscripts." *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1907–8): 121–132.
- V. Delisle, Leopold. *Le Cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale*. Vol. 2. Paris, 1874.
- Vaccari, P. A. "Il genuino commento ai Salmi di Remigio di Auxerre." *Biblica* 26 (1945): 52–99.
- Van den Eynde, Damian. "Complementary Notes on the Early Scholastic *Commentarii in Psalmos*." *Franciscan Studies* 17 (1957).
- . "Literary Note on the Earliest Scholastic *Commentarii in Psalmos*." *Franciscan Studies* 14 (1954).
- . *L'oeuvre littéraire de Géroch de Reichersberg*. Rome, 1957.
- van Elswick, H. C. *Gilbert Porreta. Sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée*. Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense 33. Louvain, 1966.
- . "Gilbert Porreta als glosator van het psalterium." In *Jubileumbundel voor G. P. Kreling*, O.P. Nijmegen, 1953.
- Van Engen, John. *Rupert of Deutz*. Berkeley, 1983.
- Verger, Jacques, and Jean Jolivet. *Bernard—Abelard; ou le cloître et l'école*. Paris, 1982.
- Vernet, F. "Gilbert de la Porrée," in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*. Col. 1350.
- Vieillard-Troiekouroff, M. "L'église Sainte-Geneviève de Paris du temps d'Abélard." In *Pierre Abélard—Pierre le Vénéral*. Paris, 1975.
- Vita Vergiliana*. Edited by J. Brummer. Leipzig, 1912.
- Ward, John O. "From Antiquity to the Renaissance: Glosses and Commentaries on Cicero's *Rhetorica*." *Medieval Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Medieval Rhetoric*, ed. James J. Murphy, 25–67. Berkeley, 1978.
- Weijers, Olga. "The Chronology of John of Salisbury's Studies in France (Metalogicon, II.10)." In *The World of John of Salisbury*, ed. Michael Wilks. Oxford, 1984.
- Weisweiler, H. "Die handschriftlichen Vorlagen zum Erstdruck von Pseudo-Beda, in *Psalmorum Librum Exegesis*." *Biblica* 18 (1937).
- Wilmart, A. "L'ancienne bibliothèque de Clairvaux." *Mémoires de la Société académique de l'Aube* 54 (1917): 175–182.
- Wilmart, A. "Le Commentaire sur les Psaumes imprimé sous le nom de Rufin." *Revue bénédictine* 31 (1914–19): 258–276.
- . "Un commentaire des Psaumes restitué à Anselme de Laon," *RTAM* 3 (1936).
- Yves de Chartres. *Lettres d'Yves de Chartres et d'autres personnages de son temps*. Edited by L. Merlet. Paris, 1855.

GENERAL INDEX

- Abelard, xiii, 6n, 7, 13, 15, 21, 73–74, 153
Accessus, 6, 55, 56, 66ff., 99, 117, 118, 129–130, 131–133, 139, 143, 148, 151 and n., 153
Adam Parvipontanus, 21, 23
Affective mode, 84, 85, 90, 154
Alberic of Reims, 6n, 13, 15
Alberic of Trois Fontaines, 36n
Alcuin, 98, 105, 106–107, 111, 117
Alexander Neckham, 127
Allegorical exegesis, 54, 64–65, 84, 86, 94, 96, 104, 153
Alphabetization, 51–52
Ambrose of Milan, 75, 94, 98, 104
Anselm of Havelberg, 6n
Anselm of Laon, 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11–12, 15, 30–34, 42n, 52, 60–62, 65, 112, 119, 120, 122–130, 145–146, 148, 155; – Gloss on the Psalms, see *Parva glosatura*
Apocalypse (glosses on), 129, 155n
Aristotle, 65n, 68, 77
Artes, see Liberal arts
Augustine, 27, 53, 75, 79–80, 95, 97, 98, 101–111, 116, 120, 122–124, 131, 133–143, 145, 149, 150
Author(s) of Psalms, 78, 82, 88–91, 94, 154
Authorial intention, 46, 77, 78, 82–84, 93, 100, 131, 149, 154
Authority (*auctoritas*), 50, 61, 87, 90, 98, 99, 141, 150
- Barthélemy of Jur, 60
Bede (see also Pseudo-Bede), 72, 113
Berengar, 112n
Bernard of Chartres, 4–6, 8, 9, 11, 14
Bernard of Clairvaux, xiii, 12n, 17, 28
Bernard of Utrecht, 70
Bibliothecae, 30–31, 40n, 45, 128, 147, 148n
Boethius, 41, 47; – Commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge*, 68, 71, 73, 76–77, 83, 86; – *Opuscula sacra*, Gilbert's commentary on, xiii, 27, 82, 151
Bruno of Chartreuse (or Pseudo-Bruno), 56, 116, 117
- Burchard of Worms, 71
- Carolingian sources, 27, 34, 36, 39–41, 49, 68–72, 75, 77, 94, 107, 111, 112, 131, 150
Cassiodorus, 47, 53–55, 57, 62–63, 65, 75, 79, 84, 87–90, 92–111, 113, 116, 120, 122, 123, 131–137, 139, 142–145, 149, 150, 153
Catena, 35, 36, 39
Cato, 70
Celestine III, 17
Chartres, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8–19, 22, 23, 29, 34, 42n, 128, 155; – library at, 11, 19
Christian of Stavelot, 72
Christology, 53, 62, 80, 100, 139, 150, 154; – two natures of Christ, 55, 62, 81, 133–135, 139, 141–143, 150, 158; – body of Christ, “Head and Members” of *Ecclesia* (q.v.), 79–81, 142–143, 155
Church, see *Ecclesia*
Cicero, 6, 38
Classics, teaching of, see Profane glosses
Clement III, 119
Clarembald of Arras, 13n
Clerval, A., 2, 9, 10
Contemplative mood, 42, 58, 93, 96, 101, 154, 155
Continuatio praemonstratensis, 126
Contreni, John, 107 and n.
Cornificians, 15
Council of Reims, xiii, 2, 7n, 17, 46n, 98
Courtès, J.-M. 90
Cross-index, 26, 44, 45, 49, 51ff., 81, 99, 130, 131, 139, 147, 151n, 152, 155
Cum-textu format, 26, 29, 35, 36, 38 and n., 40–45, 47–51, 65, 148, 152
- David, king and prophet, 63, 81, 84, 85, 88–91, 94, 95, 154
De Hamel, Christopher, 35, 44, 45
Deusdedit, 57
Dialectic, see Logic
Dialogus Ratii et Everardi, 16ff., 23

- Distichs*, see Cato
Distinctio, 56, 108
 Donatus, 6, 38, 41, 48
 Drogo, 112n
 Dronke, Peter, 11
- Ecclesia*, 63–64, 79–80, 81, 83, 85, 101, 109, 110–111, 134, 142, 143, 154, 155
Elementarium doctrinae erudimentum, 52
Enarrationes in Psalmos, see Augustine
Enchiridion, see Alcuin
 Erasmus, 119
 Esdras, 93–95
 Ethics, 78, 81, 86–88, 118
 Eugenius III, xiii
 Eusebius, 52
 Evans, G. R., xiv
 Everard “of Ypres”, 13, 16ff.
 Exegetical choices, 37, 46, 131, 137, 143, 150, 153
Expositio in Psalmos, see Bruno, Pseudo-Bruno
Expositio Psalmorum, see Cassiodorus
- Finding devices, see Searchability
 Flint, V.I.J., 115, 116
Florilegia, 106, 107, 111
- Garnerus (master), 21
 Geoffrey of Auxerre, 98
 Gerhoch of Reichersberg, 28, 31, 73, 74
 Gilbert of Poitiers; – Boethius
 Commentary, xiii, 27, 35, 38nn, 43, 45–46, 59, 151, 152; – Epistles
 Commentary, xiii, 9, 27, 28, 31n, 33, 35, 44, 59, 130, 147n, 151, 152, 155; – Prologue to Psalms
 Commentary, xivn, 29, 65, Chapter 3, 104, 107, 115, 120, 131, 147, 151, 154; – teaching activities, 7, 10–24, 128; – as bishop of Poitiers, 1, 2, 14–16, 18, 21, 31; – as chancellor of Chartres, 9–12, 15
 Gilbert the Cistercian, 27
 Gilbert the Universal, 6n
Glossa ordinaria, 2, 6, 12, 22, 36, 40, 48, 60, 124, 155; – on the Psalms (see also *Parva glosatura*), xiv, 26, 30, 40–41, 53, 73, 97, 112, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, Chapter 5
 Glunz, H., 125, 126, 146
 Grammar, 5, 6, 15, 21, 23, 66, 71, 77, 91
- Gregory the Great, 72, 116
 Grosseteste, Robert, 26
 Guibert of Nogent, 42n
- HAI glosses, 107
 Haimo of Auxerre (see also Pseudo-Haimo, 98, 105, 106–107, 110–111, 119
 Hamo, chancellor of Lincoln
 Cathedral, 43 and n
 Häring, Nicholas M. 4, 8, 17, 19, 29, 34, 45, 46
 Hartmann, W., 114, 119, 120
 Hauck, Albert, 119
 Hauréau, 4
 Haymo of Halberstadt, see Pseudo-Haimo
 Henry, Prince, 30, 31, 40n, 44–45, 128, 147n
 Herbert of Bosham, 33, 127, 146
Hexaples, see Jerome
 Hilary of Poitiers, master, 3, 4, 5
 Hilary, saint, bishop of Poitiers, 4, 75, 84, 86, 93, 94, 98, 104, 118
Historia Pontificalis, see John of Salisbury
 Historical context, xiv, 78, 81, 88, 90, 91, 93, 95–96, 130, 141, 150, 154
 Historical exegesis, 78, 81, 82, 91, 94–95, 103, 154
Homilies, see Jerome
 Honorius Augustodunensis, 73, 92, 95, 115, 116
 Hugh, abbot of Saint-Amand, 31
 Hugh of Saint-Victor, 5n, 15, 28, 72, 82, 91
 Hunt, R. W., 67–68
 Huygens, R. B. C., 67
- Institutiones grammaticae*, see Priscian
 Investiture controversy, 113
 IOH glosses, 107
 Imerius, 71
 Ivo of Chartres, 8, 21
- Jerome, 46, 50, 52, 75, 92, 94–95, 97, 103, 104, 108, 109, 116, 120, 122, 123, 131, 149, 150
 Jews, 139–141, 141n
 John of Salisbury, xiii, 2, 5n, 9, 11, 13–16, 22, 23, 75
 John Scotus, 107
- Kantorowicz, Hermann, 71
 Klibansky, R., 11

- Lanfranc of Bec, 112
 Language, problem of, 47, 53, 66–67, 80, 82, 90–91, 96, 154
 Laon, school at, 1, 2, 4, 6–11, 23, 28–29, 32–34, 52, 59–62, 64, 65, 87, 124–129, 136, 151n, 155
 Laurentius, dean, 3, 4
 Leclercq, J., 17–18
 Legal glosses, 49n, 57n, 71, 72
 Lesne, E., 11
 Leroquais, V., 34
 Letbert of Lille, 74n, 117, 118, 120n
Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum, see Jerome
 Liberal arts, 3, 5, 26, 41, 42n, 53, 55, 65–77, 80, 83–86, 149, 151
 Libraries
 Alexandria, 51
 bibliothecae, q.v.
 Chartres, 11, 19, 54n
 Clairvaux, 28, 31
 Durham Cathedral, 31
 Lincoln Cathedral, 32, 43
 of Prince Henry, q.v.
 Reims, 28n
 Saint-Victor, 49
 Saint-Vincent (Laon), 54n
 Liebeschütz, H., 14
 Literal exegesis, 78–79, 81–83, 85, 91, 94, 96, 103, 151, 154
 Liturgical divisions of Psalter, 44 and n
 Livy, 6
 Logic, 6, 14–16, 22–23, 86, 153

 Macrobius, 41, 113
Magna glosatura (see also Peter Lombard), 36n, 123, 124, 147
 Manegold of Lautenbach, 112–114
 Marginal/interlinear glossing (see also *Glossa ordinaria*), 36, 38–42, 47–48, 111–112, 122–126, 129–130, 137, 142, 145, 147–149
 Marginal references, 6, 27, 44, 45, 49–50, 97–99, 102, 104–107, 111, 152
 Maurice, prior of Kirkham, 127
Media glosatura (see also Gilbert of Poitiers, Epistles Commentary), xiii, 36n, 123–124
Metalogicon, see John of Salisbury
Metamorphosis Coliae, 20, 23
 Minnis, A. J., 67–69, 76, 84
 Mont Sainte-Geneviève, 13–16, 20, 23, 128

 Morin, G., 113, 114
 Musée Cluny, see *Termae*
 Music, 84–85, 86, 92

 Nielsen, L. O., 29
 Notre-Dame Cathedral, Paris, 20
 Numbering of Psalms, 27, 44–45, 49, 55–57
 Numerology, 92

Opuscula Sacra, see Boethius
 Order (artificial or rational), 51–52, 56–58, 61–62, 64–65, 93, 150, 152
 Origen, 79, 153
Originalia, 37, 51, 98–99, 145–146, 152
 Otto of Freising, xiii, 3, 4
 Ovid, 83, 84

 Papias, 52
 Paris, 1, 2, 10, 13–23, 29–30, 32–35, 40, 125–129, 155
Parva glosatura (see also *Glossa ordinaria*), 30, 34, 112, 122–130, 136–137, 145–148
 Pastoral issues, 6, 60–65, 81, 83, 87, 101, 103, 105, 134, 143, 150, 151n, 155
 Paucapalea, 71
 Pavia, 71
 Pauline Epistles, Gilbert's Commentary on, see Gilbert of Poitiers
 Peter Comestor, 13n
 Peter Helias, 21
 Peter Lombard, 21, 28, 31, 43, 50, 74, 112n, 125, 126; – Psalms Commentary, xiv, 29–30, 33, 38n, 53, 73, 97, 123–124, 127, 145n, 146–148, 150n, 152
 Peter of Celles, 28
 Peter the Chanter, 12
 Peter the Venerable, 40
 Phillip of Harvengt, 4n
Planctus Laurentii, 3, 9
 Poitiers, city of, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 14, 19
 Poole, R. L., 2, 4, 9, 16
 Porphyry, 68, 71, 73, 76
Porretani, xiii, 23
 Preaching, see sermons
 Priscian, 6, 21, 39, 41, 70
 Profane glosses, 6, 39, 41–43, 51, 65–69, 72, 75–76, 113, 152
 Program of exposition, xiv, 25, 26, 41, 99, 124, 130, 135, 142, 147, 150–151, 153
 Prologues, see *Accessus*

- Promissus* gloss, 21–22
 Prophecy in Psalter, 54, 62, 64, 80, 82–83, 86–90, 93, 100, 154
 Prudentius (*Psychomachia*), 70
 Psalms, text (see also *Cum textu*), 26, 27, 36–40, 44, 47–48, 152; – text variants, 38, 45–48; – titles, 94–95, 117
 Pseudo-Bede, 113–115, 120
 Pseudo-Bruno, 56, 116–117
 Pseudo-Haimo, 73, 118–120
 Pseudo-Remigius, 27, 73
Psychomachia, see Prudentius

Quaestiones, 33, 56, 58–59, 61–63, 65, 87, 129, 151 and n., 153
 Quain, E. A., 67–68, 71

 Ralph of Laon, 4, 6, 9, 15, 32, 52
 Reform, 59–60, 65
 Remigius of Auxerre (see also Pseudo-Remigius), 72, 75, 87, 98, 104, 105, 107–111, 116, 120–123, 125, 131, 150
Reportatio, 32n, 107, 129
 Robert of Auxerre, 36n, 122
 Robert of Bridlington, 112n, 127
 Robert of Chesney, 7n, 32, 43
 Robert of Melun, 13, 21, 98, 112n
 Robert Pullen, 12n, 15
 Roscelin, 112
 Rouse, Richard and Mary, 52, 59
 Rufinus, 117
 Rupert of Deutz, 98

 Saint Paul, 79–80, 83
 Saint-Victor, school and abbey, 15, 49, 60
 Searchability, 51–52, 55–58, 153
 Secular glosses, see Profane glosses
 Sedulius, 69
 Sentence collections, 2, 25, 58n, 60–65, 151 and n., 152
 Sermons, 56, 64, 101–102

 Servius, 41–42, 69–72, 76–81, 83, 86, 92
 Simon of Paris, 15
 Smalley, Beryl, 25, 29, 30, 40, 82, 123, 124, 126, 127, 146
 Songs, see Music
 Southern, R. W., 8, 10, 13–14
 Stegmüller, 117
 Stephen Langton, 22, 128
 Stephen of Senlis, bishop, 20
 Stirnemann, Patricia, 60, 128
 Strabo, see Walafrid Strabo
 Sybil, the, 89, 115
 Systematic theology, see theology

Termae, Roman baths, 21–22
 Theodore of Mopsuestia, 113
 Theology, as academic discipline, xiv–xv, 23–24, 65, 75–76, 81, 85, 96, 149, 155; – contemplative, 18, 58–59, 93, 96, 101, 154; – speculative, 6, 18, 81, 83, 153; – systematic, 41, 57–59, 64–65, 150–153
 Thierry of Chartres, 11, 15, 21, 85
 Thomas Aquinas, 62
Trivium (also see Liberal arts), 24, 42

 Vaccari, P. A., 107
 Van den Eynde, D., 29, 88
 Van Elswijk, H. C., 4, 29, 123
 Vergil, 35, 41–42, 69, 72, 76
 Vincent of Beauvais, 50

 Walafrid Strabo, 122n
 Walter of Maguelonne, 117, 118
 Weijers, O., 14
 Wibert of Ravenna, see Clement III
 William of Champeaux, 15
 William of Conches, 13–16
 William of Nangis, 36n
 William of Tyre, 16n
 Wilmart, A., 119

INDEX OF MANUSCRIPTS CITED

Manuscripts of Gilbert's Psalms Commentary are in boldface.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>Autun B.M. 40; 39n
 Bern Burgerbibl. 258; 107
 Boulogne-sur-Mer B.M. 24; 28n
 Brussels 10066-77; 70n
 Cambrai B.M. 259; 16n
 Cambridge Trinity Coll. B.V.4; 146n
 Carpentras B.M. 13; 50n
 Chartres B.M. 18; 54n
 B.M. 20; 54n
 B.M. 32; 54n
 Dijon B.M. 33; 34n
 Douai B. de la Ville 246; 130n
 Durham Cathedral A.111.10; 28n,
 31, 36n
 Grenoble B.M. 240; 117n
 Hereford O.6.XII; 127n
 O.5.VIII; 129n
 Klosterneuberg Stiftsb. 815; 28
 and n
 Laon B. Comm. 17; 64n
 B. Comm. 27; 54n
 B. Comm. 29; 135n, 136 and n,
 137n
 Lincoln Cathedral 174; 43
 Lucca B. pubb. 1433; 70n
 Oxford Balliol 36; 7n, 10, 31, 32n,
 43, 97n
 Oxford Bodleian Auct.D.2.1; 34n, 115n
 Auct.D.4.6; 29n, 34n, 115n</p> | <p>Paris Bibl. Nat. lat. 105; 73
 B.N. lat. 439; 49
 B.N. lat. 442; 73
 B.N. lat. 1977; 107
 B.N. lat. 2194; 157
 B.N. lat. 2577; 50n
 B.N. lat. 7900; 41n
 B.N. lat. 7926; 41n
 B.N. lat. 11550; 39
 B.N. lat. 14419; 49
 B.N. lat. 16236; 41
 Bibl. Arsenal lat. 1117; 3n, 5n
 Bibl. Mazarine 202; 48n
 Reg. Hisp. 2C1; 29n
 Reims B.M. 689; 17n
 Rouen B.M. 118; 59n
 Tours B.M. 93; 48n
 Troyes B.M. 488; 30, 44, 49n,
 51n
 B.M. 511; 128
 B.M. 815; 28 and n
 B.M. 988; 34, 45, 48n, 158
 B.M. 2266; 31n, 44n
 Valenciennes B.M. 42; 34n, 115n
 B.M. 43; 34n, 115n
 B.M. 44; 31
 Vatican Reg. Lat. 295; 119n
 Urb. lat. 532; 41n, 48n
 Vorau Stiftsb. 261; 28 and n</p> |
|--|---|

All citations from Gilbert's Commentary on the Psalms have been taken from Paris B.N. lat. 12004.